SCOTTISH JOURNAL
of
THEOLOGY

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Vol. 11, *No.* 3 *September* 1958

EDITORS:
REV. PROFESSOR T. F. TORRANCE
REV. PROFESSOR J. K. S. REID

OLIVER & BOYD LTD.
EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT
LONDON: 39A WELBECK STREET, W.1.

SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Published Quarterly

Editors:

Rev. Prof. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol.,
21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh, 9 (Telephone 46114)

Rev. Prof. J. K. S. Reid, D.D.,
44 Headingley Mount, Leeds, 6 (Telephone 56853)

Consulting Editors:

Rev. Principal J. H. S. Burleigh, D.D., B.Litt.
Chairman of Directors

Rev. Prof. David Cairns, D.D.

Rev. Prof. N. W. Porteous, D.D.

Rev. Prof. A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D.

Directors:

The above-named together with

Rev. Prof. E. P. Dickie, M.C., D.D.

Rev. J. B. Torrance, B.D.

Rev. J. Heron, B.D., S.T.M.

Rev. A. McCosh, M.A., S.T.M.

Rev. J. A. McFadden, B.D.

Rev. J. W. Stevenson, M.A.

Rev. R. S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc.

Rev. T. M. Murchison, M.A., *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTIONS are invited from members of all branches of the Christian Church.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE—MSS and Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Registered Office.

PRICE: Six Shillings and Sixpence per copy, post free.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: Twenty-four Shillings, post free.

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER AND BOYD FOR SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY LTD.

Registered Office : TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH, 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

Consecration and Ordination, by the Rev. Professor T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol., Edinburgh 225

The Problem of Realism in R. Niebuhr's Christology, by Professor J. M. Lochman, Prague 253

Some Comments on Professor Hick's Article on 'The Christology of D. M. Baillie', by the Very Rev. Professor John Baillie, D.D., D.Théol., D.Litt., LL.D., Edinburgh 265

The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew, by the Rev. Professor Dan O. Via, Jr., Ph.D., Winston-Salem, N. Carolina 271

Early Exegesis of the Parables, by the Rev. M. F. Wiles, M.A., Ibadan 287

Book Reviews

Vincent Taylor: *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, by the Rev. Professor J. L. M. Haire, Belfast 302

Paul Althaus: *Das So-genannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus*, by the Rev. Professor David Cairns, Aberdeen 305

John MacIntyre: *The Christian Doctrine of History*, by the Rev. Principal W. A. Whitehouse, Durham 306

William D. Maxwell: *A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland*, by the Rev. Dr E. Evans, Hellifield 308

Oscar Cullmann: *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection from the Dead?*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 311

Emil Brunner: *Faith, Hope and Love*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 312

F. D. Maurice: *Theological Essays*, by the Rev. Professor H. E. W. Turner, Durham 313

A. M. Hunter: *Introducing New Testament Theology*, by the Rev. Dr A. J. B. Higgins, Leeds 315

J. A. T. Robinson: *Jesus and His Coming*, by the Rev. Dr A. J. B. Higgins, Leeds 316

S. G. F. Brandon: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 318

Charles Masson: *Les Deux Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 319

F. L. Cross (ed.): *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, by the Rev. Professor T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh 320

Kurt Galling (ed.): *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, by the Rev. Professor T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh 322

PAGE

G. H. Williams and A. M. Mergal (edd.): *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, by the Rev. Principal R. L. Child, Oxford 324

J. A. Comenius: *A Perfect Reformation*, by the Rev. Robert Smith, Balerno 325

Imre Revesz: *History of the Hungarian Reformed Church*, by the Rev. Robert Smith, Balerno 326

Kenneth Cragg: *The Call of the Minaret*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 327

John B. Moss: *Man's Religions*; L. H. Marshall: *Rivals of the Christian Faith*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 328

Raymond Raynes: *Darkness no Darkness*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 330

K. E. Skydsgaard: *One in Christ*, by the Rev. Professor T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh 330

Cyril Korolevsky: *Living Languages in Catholic Worship*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 333

Charles R. A. Cunliffe (ed.): *English in the Liturgy*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 333

James M. Ure (ed.): *The Benedictine Office*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 335

A Directory of the Religious Life for the Use of those concerned with the Administration of the Religious Life in the Church of England, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 336

IN THIS ISSUE

Articles on Ordination

Niebuhr's Christology
D. M. Baillie's Christology
the Church as the Body of Christ

The Biblical Study is on the Exegesis of the Parables

Among the reviews are books on

the Person of Christ
the Christian Doctrine of History
Worship in the Church of Scotland
Immortality or Resurrection?
Christianity and the Religions
Liturgical Language

CONSECRATION AND ORDINATION

by The Rev. Professor T. F. TORRANCE

In order to understand the NT teaching about consecration and ordination we have to examine the rites and language of the OT tradition. The rites were not carried over as such into the Christian Church, for they were fulfilled in Christ and abrogated, but the NT does use the language of the rites to speak both of Christ and His Church, and it does adapt some of the OT rites for its own use, but with entire freedom and new significance. The basic line we have to consider is the consecration of the priest, and king, and prophet in the OT, and see how they are fulfilled in Christ, and then see how *in this Christ* the NT thinks of the ministry as consecrated and ordained.

The Consecration and Ordination of the Priest

The main passages that concern us are Exod. 28 and 29, Lev. 6, 9, 7, 8 and Num. 8. It is worth remembering right away that the Leviticus passages fell in the Jewish Lectionary for the Passover week, and are reflected in the Gospels, especially in John 13-17.

To get the proper perspective we have to remember that Israel was consecrated in the Covenant to be a holy people, a kingdom of priests to God (Exod. 19.6, Lev. 20.26; Deut. 7.6f, 14.21, 26.19, 28.9; cf. Isa. 62.12). As such, too, Israel was God's 'first-born son'; that is, it occupied among the human family the part of 'the head of the house' (the *ben- bayith*, the householder or steward of God's holy purposes, reflected in several of Jesus' parables). Within Israel it would appear that the primitive priests were the first-born sons, the heads of the house. That is preserved in the Passover rite where the ceremony is conducted by the head of the house. But the first-born were 'redeemed back' for life among the people and their place was taken by the tribe of Levi (Num. 3.12f, etc). Thus within Israel as a priestly nation, one tribe is set aside for priestly functions instead of the first-born, and within the tribe of Levi, the 'sons of Aaron' are set apart for special functions as litur-

gical priests. The OT priesthood has thus an interim institutional character, and its importance lies in its functions and in obedience to the divine ordinances. It was the business of the Levites and priests to teach the Law to Israel, and so they lived scattered through the twelve tribes. The Sons of Aaron came to be divided into twenty-four courses, twelve functioning in the Temple and twelve in Israel, though all twenty-four came up to Jerusalem for the great Festivals.

How then were *the priests* consecrated and ordained? This is very fully described. The whole congregation (*Ekklesia*) assembled at the door of the Tabernacle where they were addressed by Moses and told they were about to act in accordance with God's ordinance. Then he 'brought forward' or 'brought near' or 'presented' Aaron and his sons. They were solemnly washed at the Laver, and clothed with priestly garments. Aaron was anointed with oil by pouring, but his sons were only sprinkled with his anointing oil. Aaron only was called 'the anointed', the *christos*. Then there followed sacrifices, the most significant of which was the 'consecration-offering' or 'fill-offering'. Some of this along with unleavened bread was offered for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, some of it was broken up into portions, and portions of flesh and bread were put into the hands of Aaron and his sons who offered them as 'peace-offerings'. Then Aaron and his sons repaired to the door of the Tabernacle and ate in the presence of the congregation a sacred meal of what remained of the flesh of the fill-offering and bread of the consecration-offering—that was called 'a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'. It was repeated for seven days, during which they stayed within the precincts of the Tabernacle.

It is to be noted that in this rite the chief and proper subject is Aaron the High Priest, although his sons are consecrated through association with him, and have their hands filled too and share with him in the sacred meal of consecration. But Aaron alone is the *christos*. (In an extended sense, of course, all Israel is spoken of as *anointed Messiah*, Ps. 84.9; Hab. 3.13; Ps. 89.38, 51.) That act takes place only once and does not need to be repeated. The *Minhah* that Aaron offers avails for himself and the sons of his house. On his death, his eldest son was clothed with his high-priestly garments and was conse-

crated with his priests in the same way—but the anointing was apparently not repeated, except to recover a break in the priestly line (2 Chron. 13.9). It has also to be noted that although the priests were consecrated only once, every time they went in and out of the Tabernacle or Temple they renewed their consecration through washing their hands and feet, while the High Priest renewed his consecration through solemn and total baptismal ablution once a year in preparation for the renewal of the Covenant on the Day of Atonement. The consecration of Aaron and the sons of his house to the priesthood was called 'a covenant of salt'.

What about *the Levites*? In Num. 8 we are told that all the Levites were cleansed and 'separated' within Israel, cleansed by the sprinkling of the water of expiation (used at circumcision and in cleansing the leper to restore him to membership in the priestly race) and then they were 'presented' with the same offerings as Aaron and his sons; but in addition all the Levites *had hands laid on them* by the Children of Israel (doubtless acting through their 'elders') gathered at the door of the Tabernacle, who offered them up to this holy use as their representatives. Then Aaron took the Levites and offered them before the Lord as an oblation on behalf of the people that they might do the service of the Lord. Here the laying on of hands indicates the representative part played by the Levites, but as such they are offered unto God. Thus in their case ordination is twofold: laying on of hands and commissioning by the whole priestly people, and offering to God as consecration for His service.

What about *Moses* in all this? As Augustine pointed out long ago, Moses stands above all this without any ceremonial consecration. It is he who offers the sacrifices for Aaron and his sons, offers them to the Lord, and consecrates them. He himself had no other consecration than that of his supreme relation to the Word of God alone. Moses did not therefore pass on a consecration he had himself received; he acted only as 'the servant of the Lord', and the entire validity of the consecration of the priesthood depended on God's command and grace alone—not on any 'priestly grace'. The priesthood is represented as God's 'gift' (Num. 18.7) and rests on its 'givenness'. Hence the Hebrew word to give, *nathan*, is frequently employed

for ordaining to the priesthood; it is an appointment of grace.

The Language of Consecration and Ordination

The general term used for consecration and/or ordination is, in the LXX, *hagiazo*, meaning 'sanctify' or make holy. The emphasis here is always upon the fundamental fact that God will be sanctified or hallowed in the midst of His people (Exod. 31.13, Lev. 20.8—cf. also the incident of Nadab and Abihu in Lev. 10, 21, 22, etc.). All consecration or hallowing is a sharing in God's hallowing of Himself in the midst of His people, and has its significance only within the Covenant in which He is Holy and requires His people to be holy too.

Three distinctive terms are used, however, to describe this sanctification or consecration of the priest in holy things (cf. Exod. 29.29f):

(*a*) To clothe with priestly garments—'to put on' (including baptismal ablution etc.);
(*b*) To anoint with holy oil (the preparation of which was strictly guarded as a secret) given along with sprinkling of blood;
(*c*) 'To fill the hands', which was accompanied by a special sacrifice of consecration.

Of these three it is the third that is the distinctive term for consecration or ordination—the priest has his hands filled: *mille' yadh* (מִלֵּא יָד Exod. 28.41, 29.29, 33.35, Lev. 8.33, 16.32, ch. 2, ch. 10, Num. 3.3, Judges 17.5, 12, 1 Kings 13.33, 2 Chron. 13.9; cf. 2 Chron. 29.31; Isa. 43.26). The offerings of consecration were called 'fillings' (*millu'im*).

What 'filling the hands' means exactly is not very clear. Generally it means that the priest has the priesthood committed to him; he receives it as a gift. Specifically it means that the act of consecration is brought to its fulfilment or completion when his hands are filled with the holy oblations. It can also be applied in an extended sense to the consecration of the altar through having the oblation laid on it. Its meaning is thus twofold, which comes out very well in the Greek of the LXX, in its twofold translation of *mille' yadh*:

(*a*) *pleroun tas cheiras* (πληροῦν τὰς χεῖρας). Cf. Lev. 7.29, Exod. 32.29.

(*b*) *teleioun tas cheiras* (τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας) or simply *teleioun* as applied to the priest as object or in the passive with the priest as subject. It is almost equivalent to *hagiazein*. Cf. Exod. 28.41, 29.33.

These words are used, then, to describe the act of the consecration of the High Priest in whose self-consecration the sons of his house are also consecrated; that consecration is brought to its completion in the filling of the hands with the oblations and in the sacrificial meal of flesh and bread, 'the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'.

The Language of Consecration in the NT

Although in the OT 'to fill the hands' was the more technical term, it does not make very good Greek when translated literally. It is natural therefore that in Greek the word *teleioun* should be preferred to *pleroun tas cheiras*. The latter expression may perhaps lie behind John 3.35, which has reference to Christ's baptismal consecration in the Jordan and His anointing of the Spirit. But the underlying Aramaic has been turned into smooth Greek, and the 'filling of the hands' is not very recognisable except to one familiar with the OT rite. Along with this should be compared John 17.2-4; cf. also John 4.34, 5.36. Possibly the Pauline *pleroma* hints of this too sometimes, cf. Eph. 1.23ff and 3.19.

It is however the word *teleioun* that is prominent in the NT, especially in the Fourth Gospel and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The verb *teleioun* is of course often used in the NT with no relation to the conception of priestly consecration, but when it is found in John 17, Christ's high-priestly prayer, which clearly reflects the reading of Lev. 7-8, we must see it in a different light. The Evangelist also uses the other word *hagiazein*, e.g. 17.16-18: 'Sanctify them in the truth. Thy Word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world and for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' Then in verse 23 Jesus prays that the disciples might be consecrated in one (*teteleiomenoi eis hen*).

When we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews there are several instances of *teleioun* which undoubtedly refer to the consecration

of the High Priest, while the word *hagiazein* is used in a sense parallel both to the OT and John 17. Thus Heb. 2.11: 'For both he who sanctifies (or consecrates) and those who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.' In Heb. 7.28 and 9.9 the other word, *teleioun*, is used of the consecration of Christ the High Priest. In the tenth chapter the writer uses both terms, *hagiazein* and *teleioun*, to describe the fact that through Christ's own self-offering once and for all we are consecrated. But in Hebrews this concept of consecration means what Paul meant by justification through the blood of Christ and sanctification through His Spirit. It is in Christ's own consecration of Himself on our behalf, which both justifies us and sanctifies us as His holy servants, that we are made to share in His consecration in such a way that through Jesus Christ our High Priest we all, with our bodies washed with clean water and with our consciences sprinkled with His blood, draw near to worship God, that is as priests in the House of God. It is interesting also to note that in this Epistle the institutional priesthood of Aaron is set aside, because it is fulfilled and abrogated in Christ; and that He is High Priest as God's First-Born Son, and therefore we are all first-born sons in Him, and the Church is the Church of the first-born. That is to say here, where the institutional priesthood is done away, all God's children are priests after the fashion of the first-born in Israel. It is the priesthood of sonship in Christ the Son of God. Just as we are given to share in His Sonship, so we are given to share in His Priesthood. In Christ our sonship and priesthood are the same.

The Consecration of the King

The classical passage about this is found in 1 Kings 11.12, 17 which describes the consecration of king Jehoiadah, and which reposes upon Deuteronomy 17.18-20. Apparently it is also based on the rites formed under King David and carried out with regard to Solomon (1 Kings 1.33ff, 1 Chron. 29.22f; cf. 2 Chron. 6.42). The main elements here are as follows:

(*a*) The anointing, possibly with washing in the Gihon. David and Saul were the first to be anointed, and the anointing was accompanied by the gift of the Spirit

(1 Sam. 10.1, 16.13; cf. 1 Sam. 26.11, Ps. 2.2 (Acts 4.26)). David himself was anointed three times (cf. 2 Sam. 2.4, 5.3. The Davidic anointing was regarded in the OT as indicative of the Messiah. Cf. Ps. 45.7 and Hab. 1.9).

(*b*) The kings were enthroned and crowned—the royal insignia of David were apparently used in later times.

(*c*) The putting into the hands of the king of the 'Testimony'. According to Deuteronomy the king had to copy out the book of the Law with his own hand, so as to remember it and rule by it.

(*d*) A covenant was made between the king, God and the people.

In the case of God's Covenant with David, it was known as 'a covenant of salt', like the covenant made by God with the house of Aaron.

In the case of Solomon's consecration we know that there was also prayer and sacrifice—see 1 Chron. 29.22f.

Here, then, in the consecration of the King the fundamental pattern of consecration was similar to that of the consecration of the priest, involving: anointing, filling of the hands, and affirmation of the covenant-relation. The difference lies chiefly in that to which the King is consecrated, kingship, not sacrifice, and that the King's hands are filled therefore not with oblations but with the Law. He is crowned and enthroned, which does not apply to the priests.

The Consecration of the Prophet

We have even less information about this, but a clear instance of the consecration of Elisha by Elijah is given in 1 Kings 19.16. It was by *anointing* followed later by investment with the prophetic *mantle*. In Ps. 105.15 'the anointed' and the prophets are synonymous. The anointing of both Saul and David gave them prophetic gifts, and presumably that meant that the anointing of kings was an extension of the anointing of prophets through whose Word proclaimed and enunciated it is God who rules as King. In Isa. 61.1 the Servant of the Lord speaks of himself as anointed to preach the Gospel, and Christ claimed this to be fulfilled in Himself, Luke 4.18, John 11.36.

In addition to this OT tradition, it should be noted that in

the Judaean Scrolls the Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah, is regarded apparently as deriving both from the House of David and from the House of Aaron—the anointed Priest-King (unless two *Messiahs* are intended). The members of the community initiated into the new covenant are spoken of as 'anointed ones' and as forming a holy and 'priestly' messianic community. That may have some influence on the NT, e.g. on 1 Peter.

Summary of NT Teaching

Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of the threefold OT consecration to the office of priest, king and prophet. We have seen something of the fulfilment of priestly consecration in Christ, but kingly and prophetic consecration is also fulfilled in Him (Luke 4.18, Acts 4.26, 10.38, Heb. 1.9). This was all fulfilled in His anointing by the Spirit, which no doubt refers to His birth of the Spirit, but also to His anointing at His Baptism in the Jordan, but it is as the Anointed Son of the Father that He gathers up and fulfils the threefold anointing of Prophet, Priest and King. The Church which He has made His own was anointed with Christ's Spirit at Pentecost by the baptism of the Spirit, so that through baptism all who come to Christ are not only given the right to be sons of God but are anointed with His anointing, receiving the *chrism* of the Spirit (1 John 2.20, 27, 2 Cor. 1.21), or are given the *seal* of the Spirit, as St. Paul puts it.

Here, then, in Christ the First-Born Son of God and our High Priest, we are restored to the priestly Kingdom, for He has washed us from our sins in His own blood and made us kings and priests unto God. Everyone who is a son of God through Christ the Son belongs to this royal priesthood, and shares in Christ's self-consecration on our behalf. Christ alone is the *Christos*, the Anointed and Consecrated One (cf. John 11.36), but we who follow Him in baptism are given to share in it, putting off the old impurity and putting on Christ as our priestly garment, clothed with His righteousness, His consecration and His holiness. Here there is no institutional priesthood like that of the Aaronic order. That was an imperfect interim-measure only, necessarily done away when the true priesthood of sonship, the priesthood of the first-born, was restored in Christ. Here priesthood and sonship are the same,

but when priesthood and sonship are the same, it is baptism through which we are consecrated as sons of God which is our consecration to priesthood in Christ.

Consecration and Ordination of the Ministry in the NT

When we turn to the consecration and ordination of a special ministry as Christ's gift to His Church we find that this has its place only within the consecration of the whole membership of Christ's Body, and therefore within the ministry of the whole Body, which it has through sharing in Christ's vicarious self-consecration. But within that there is something else. (1) The special consecration of the Apostleship in Christ's self-consecration; and (2) the Apostolic ordination of others through the laying on of hands and prayer.

1. *The special consecration of the Apostles in Christ*

The accounts of Christ's appointment of the Apostles, His 'making' of them, of His drawing them into a very private and close relation to Himself and to His teaching and passion, and above all His special purpose for them in the Last Supper, as reflected in the Fourth Gospel as well as the Synoptics, are of fundamental importance. Although the Lord's Supper belongs to the whole Church, its first enactment, the Last Supper, belonged peculiarly to the Apostles, who were at that point given a special place in the New Covenant and in the Kingdom of Christ, appointed to sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, as the Patriarchs of the New Israel, the Foundation of the Church. Jesus' solemn washing of their feet and His deliberate actions at the Supper clearly designed for the disciples peculiarly, and His High-Priestly prayer of consecration in which He prayed above all for the Disciples, makes it clear that He regarded Himself going forth to the Cross, as the High Priest in whose self-oblation and self-consecration He was giving the Disciples to share in a most intimate way as 'the sons of His house'. His self-consecration as the *Christos*, His action as the High Priest on the Great Day of Atonement, was fulfilled once and for all, and can never be repeated. Just as when Aaron acted all Israel acted in him and through him, for he acted for all Israel, while at the same time the sons of his

house had a special place in it, being sprinkled with the blood of sacrifice, and sprinkled with oil of anointing; so when Christ went forth to the Cross, all His people were given to share in it, for He acted on their behalf and in their stead, and yet in a special way the Twelve were given to be related to it—they alone went forth to the events of His passion after having shared with Him the consecration-meal of the bread and wine of the Last Supper, and they alone, as it were, were sprinkled with His blood in Gethsemane where they were taken to watch and pray with Him in His awful agony; and they alone when He returned from His sacrifice had breathed upon them His Spirit in the Upper Room and so were anointed with His anointing. As such the Apostles belonged to the once and for all events of the Founding of the New Covenant in the body and blood of Christ; they remain for ever the authoritative witnesses of the New Covenant, the Pillars of the Church, in whom and through whom Jesus Christ made an everlasting Covenant of Salt (Acts 1.4—*synalizomenos*) with His Church making it a royal priesthood in Himself established upon the Apostles.

The Apostle-Disciples were appointed to their ministry like Moses directly through the Word, and were given to sit, as it were, in Moses' Seat or rather in Christ's Seat, inasmuch as they mediated His Word to the Church and in Christ's Name were appointed to rule and order His Church; but (after the pattern of the sons of Aaron) the Apostles shared peculiarly in Christ's self-consecration and anointing. All that is something that cannot be repeated, and therefore cannot be extended. The Apostles can have no successors, for the Apostles remain under Christ as the permanent authorities over the Church, the foundation upon which all other ministry within the Church depends. And so they were sent out by Christ with His Commission to engage in the Mission of Reconciliation. It was in the fulfilment of that commission and mission that they came to ordain others to the ministry, and gave in their ordination in the name of Christ the sign of the laying on of hands to attest that they were sent to fulfil their ministry within the One Commission of Christ to His Apostles, and within the once and for all Consecration of His Church upon the foundation of the Apostles. But in using and appointing an entirely different method of ordination from that which they themselves had

received the Apostles showed unmistakably that they were in no sense extending their office to others, but ordaining a ministry in dependence upon their unique ministry in Christ.

2. *The Apostolic ordination of others through the laying on of hands and prayer*[1]

(Acts 6.6, 13.3, 1 Tim. 4.14, 5.22, 2 Tim. 1.6; cf. Acts 14.23, 2 Cor. 8.19.)

The laying on of hands (ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν, ἐπιτιθέναι τὰς χεῖρας) with prayer is the only ceremony that is taken over from the OT by the NT Church for the consecration and ordination of its ministry. The consecration of the Church and of its ministry in the Apostles had of course already taken place, and taken place once and for all, so that whenever in the historical Church there is an ordination to the ministry that ordination is grounded upon the once and for all consecration of the Church and its Apostolic ministry in Christ, shares in it, takes place only within it, and is the means whereby that consecration is through prayer related directly and particularly to those set apart for the ministry within the sphere of the Apostolic Commission and Mission.

It does not appear that the Early Church took over the rite of laying on of hands from Judaism so much as from the OT directly. The elders or presbyters in the Sanhedrin were instituted or ordained by enthronement in Moses' seat, and later on rabbinic ordination by laying on of hands took the place of this during the Bar Cochba revolt (A.D. 132). That rite may have had earlier usage in Judaism which influenced the NT, but it would appear that the Apostles went back to the OT itself for their guidance.

As Professor David Daube has pointed out, three different words are used for a rite of blessing or ordination through hands in the OT. (1) *Nasa'* to describe the priestly blessing when hands were lifted up, e.g. in Aaronic benediction. This was an act of prayer and blessing in which the name of God was put upon the people—the act used by Jesus in blessing His disciples at His ascension; (2) *sim* or *shith*, which describes the act of

[1] In this section I am somewhat indebted to the illuminating discussions of A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Ministry* (shortly to be published as an Occasional Paper of *SJT*), and D. Daube, *The NT and Rabbinic Judaism*, the chapter on 'The laying on of hands'.

placing hands upon someone for blessing, e.g. in patriarchal blessing of Joseph's sons by Jacob, and possibly was used in acts of healing; this would be the word used of Jesus' acts of healing; and possibly at baptism; (3) *samakh*, which described the solemn acts of laying (literally 'leaning') on of hands as applied to sacrifices when sins were symbolically transferred to a victim, or laying on of hands where the transference of guilt or responsibility was indicated, e.g. before stoning a blasphemer, or in an act of instituting people to responsible office.[1] There is no evidence that Jesus ever used this, and indeed He would not have used it for He would never have appointed or instituted anyone as His successor. In Judaism the laying on of hands was not used for the ordaining of 'the seven of a city' or 'elders', although their appointment to the local presbytery required the authorisation of the Presbytery of the People or the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. In the second century and possibly in the first rabbis were ordained by *samakh*, the solemn laying on of hands, called 'the laying on of hands of the elders'.

There are two important instances of laying on of hands in the OT for the Christian precedent. (1) The laying on of hands through which the Levites were ordained to their office. This was an act carried out by the people, presumably through their elders, and was a *lay-act* in which the Levites were clearly inducted into responsible representation of the people, appointed to stand for the first-born of the people in their ministry at the Tabernacle. That act of laying on of hands was completed when they were offered to God by the priests. (2) The other precedent is the act of Moses in ordaining Joshua as his successor in the leadership of the people. In doing so Moses was commanded 'to put of his honour upon Joshua' (Num. 27.18, 23, Deut. 34.9). With this act God bestowed upon Joshua His Spirit to enable him to fulfil his appointed task. Joshua was not of course ordained to take Moses' place either as priest or as the mediator of the Word of God, but simply in civil and military leadership of the people. He was lay-governor under the Kingship of God. This was in a different sense an act of *lay-ordination.*

[1] I cannot follow Professor Daube in giving *samakh* a psychological interpretation to mean the 'extending' or 'pouring' of personality from one to another. It is surely not extending of personality but conjunction of responsibility that is intended in these OT accounts.

Laying on of Hands in the NT

The first case of laying on of hands (ἐπιτιθέναι τὰς χεῖρας—*samakh*), was that of the seven 'elder-deacons' in Acts 6.[1] Here hands were laid on the seven by the congregation, not by the Apostles (except according to Codex Bezae), but they were set before the Apostles, to indicate that the Apostles had part in the act. It was, however, an act of lay-ordination like that of the Levites in the OT. At the same time the language used in the OT of Joshua's ordination is clearly reflected in Acts, in the choice of seven men in whom there was the Spirit. But again the language also seems to reflect the appointment of the seventy elders in Num. 11.6, when, without any laying on of hands, God put His Spirit upon them, to enable them to fulfil their appointment to the Presbytery of Israel. The laying on of hands upon the seven 'elder-deacons' in Acts was accompanied by prayer, and those ordained were given the Spirit in fulfilment of their ministry. The fact that the Apostles did not lay hands on them suggests that they were not being appointed as their deputies, but only as their assistants, i.e. Levites! Hence it was natural to describe these 'elders' as 'deacons' in distinction from the others.

The instance of 'the separation' of Paul and Barnabas by the command of the Spirit and their ordination at the hands of a group of prophets and teachers to which they belonged at Antioch seems to be a case of ordination for special embassage, in which they were commissioned to carry out a particular task on behalf of the rest. They were not ordained as 'rabbinic' pupils or disciples, but rather sent out as 'apostles' or authorised messengers of the community on a limited mission. The language used here (e.g. 'separate me Paul and Barnabas') suggests that used of the Levites in Num. 8.6f. It does not seem to refer to ordination in the proper sense. This sort of thing was a common rabbinic practice in the second century, but may well have been used earlier.

The most important instance of ordination by laying on of hands in the NT is that of Timothy described in two verses, in 1 Tim. 4.14 and 2 Tim. 1.6, which have to be taken together

[1] According to *Sanhedrin* 1.6 a community of one hundred and twenty men was entitled to elect its local *sanhedrin* of seven elders. Is this the significance of Acts 1.15: 'the number of names together were about one hundred and twenty'?

with the other passages in Timothy and Titus regarding the appointment and ordination of other ministers.

In 1 Tim. 4.14 we read: 'Neglect not the gift that is in thee which was given thee by *prophecy* with the laying on of hands of the Presbytery.' In 2 Tim. 1.6 we read: 'Stir up the gift of God which is in thee through the laying on of my hands.' Putting these together, as I think we must, I make the meaning to be as follows: Timothy has been carefully instructed in the faith and trained in the *didaskalia* which he exercised; in that training it was clear that he was called to the ministry, that the Word had imparted to him a gift for its ministry; at the same time that gift was regarded as imparted formally through the act of laying on of hands, authorising him as an accredited teacher and minister, but used by God as the means of imparting to him a spiritual gift from God, a *charisma* for the ministry; the act of laying on of hands was carried out by Timothy's teacher, Paul, and by the Presbytery acting together. It is possible that the laying on of hands of the presbytery, *epithesis ton cheiron tou presbyteriou*, is simply a rabbinic term for 'the ordination of elders', *semikhath zeqenim* (Bab. San. 13b) as Professor Daube suggests. But it seems more likely that it means that the Presbytery as a whole laid on hands, with Paul acting along with them and doubtless presiding over them in the act of ordination. The fact that Timothy, who is put in charge of missionary Churches by Paul and commanded to appoint elders or presbyters in them, is not to lay hands suddenly on people, indicates that he would himself be the chief minister in ordaining presbyters in that area under his supervision, but that he should only do it after due and careful training. According to rabbinic rules a man was not to be ordained to teach until he had reached the age of forty. It may be with that in mind that Paul exhorts Timothy not to let anyone despise his youth, for young as he is he is fully authorised by Paul and the Presbytery to undertake his ministry.

This instance is of fundamental importance for a number of reasons:

(*a*) It provides us with a clear case of what even Professor Daube, who sees it as parallel to rabbinic ordination, calls 'apostolic succession'. Timothy is not appointed to be an Apostle, but he has the full authorisation of Paul the Apostle

to do the office of a minister, and indeed of a bishop, and as such he fulfils the same office in ordaining others as Paul fulfilled in ordaining him.

(*b*) But this ordination is a corporate act of the Presbytery. It was the Presbytery that was the repository of authorisation at the local level, although the Presbytery had also to act within the sphere of the Apostolic commission and mission, and that link is supplied by St. Paul. It is not suggested that it was the local Presbytery that joined with Paul in ordaining Timothy—it was probably the Presbytery at Timothy's own home Church, or perhaps even at Jerusalem. We do not know. At any rate it is clear that the Presbytery is the medium of ordination although Paul has a special part in it, and Timothy afterwards takes a similiar place in the ordination of others. Presumably, however, he would not act apart from the Presbytery, except perhaps in founding a new Church and appointing and ordaining new presbyters, in which instance he would be the authorised person acting within the Apostolic commission to undertake that; but once established the Presbytery with Timothy would act as a body. Here then both 'presbyterian' and 'episcopalian' elements are clearly held together.

Now in interpreting what the NT had to say about ordination and its adaptation of OT rites, we have to remember that nowhere does the NT take over an OT rite and develop it as such. What it always does is to lay several images or rites together, the elements of which are then used in the freedom of the Apostolic Church for its own purposes in forming a new image or a new rite which derives its significance not from the OT ceremonies or images as such but from Christ and from what the Apostolic Church makes of it. How then are we to interpret the NT concept of ordination?

(1) The first thing to note is that by selecting this rite of laying on of hands, which was essentially a *lay-rite* both in the OT and in Judaism, the Christian Church made it decisively clear that the Christian ministry was not to be interpreted in the sense of the priesthood of the OT. That had been fulfilled in Christ who only is Priest. But because all that was fulfilled in Christ permanent elements of significance in it might well be transferred from Christ to the interpretation of the Christian rite. That is what happened.

(2) The main element in the laying on of hands seems undoubtedly to be the commissioning of ministers of the Word to proclaim the *kerygma* and teach the *didache* in obedience to the Apostolic witness to Christ and in following their example and ordinances. Ordination is for those who labour in the Word, and carries with it acknowledged authorisation to do so, authorisation that derives from the Apostolic Commission as an attestation of the tradition of the Apostolic teaching of the Gospel. Here we recall the OT rites of consecrating the King by filling his hands with 'the testimony', and the consecration of the prophet through whose word it is God who acts and rules.

(3) But this ordination has other elements associated with it, the gift of the Spirit, the bestowal of a special *charisma* for the ministry, and it is performed with prayer. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that while in the OT three different sets of expressions are used to describe three different forms of laying on or lifting up of hands, the NT seems to blend elements of all three together. And that was certainly done immediately after NT times. Thus in addition to the strict concept of *samakh*, responsible commissioning with authority to minister the Word, ordination also draws into its orbit the concept of blessing the one ordained through prayer, and calling upon him the gift of the Spirit, who brings a special *charisma* to the one ordained for the fulfilment of his ministry. But the other OT idea found in the practice of *samakh* is not absent, that of offering or presenting the one ordained before God, symbolised by the presentation of 'the Seven' before the Apostles, as Joshua was presented before Eleazer by Moses when he ordained him, or as the Levites were presented before the Tabernacle and then offered to God. That is a concept which Paul applies to his missionary congregations; he offers them to God as an oblation. According to Calvin this element is a powerful ingredient in ordination, for the ordinand after the pattern of the OT sacrifices is through laying on of hands offered to God for His service and so consecrated. But this act of ordination takes place in the name of Christ the King and Head of the Church, so that all the ordinand does when ordained is to be done in the Name of Christ which is his authority, and nothing is to be done apart from that Name. But to ordain in the name of Christ, and to act in the name of Christ, is clearly to act within the self-consecration

of Christ on our behalf, as the reference to the Name of God declared by Christ to the Apostles in John 17 clearly indicates.

(4) Ordination thus means ordination in the sphere where we are all consecrated through participation in Christ's self-consecration on our behalf. But just as the disciples were specially related to that self-consecration of Christ at the Last Supper and in His solemn prayer of consecration, as those who would take the Word of Christ to others so that others also would believe through their Word and be drawn into the unity of the one Church of Christ, so we cannot dissociate ordination in the Name of Christ from that fact. Those ordained are to be regarded as drawn in a special way within the sphere of Christ's self-consecration so that it is only as they share in His self-consecration that they can minister the Word to others in His Name. It is in this connexion then that we have to see the relation of ordination to participation in the Lord's Supper, and see the Lord's Supper as (also) the NT counterpart to the meal of consecration in which Aaron and his sons participated at their consecration, 'a meal of thanksgiving and praise'. That expression is found in an important passage in Heb. 13 in which it speaks of the ministry in several injunctions and adds: 'Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of lips which make confession to his name.' It was not unnatural therefore that in very early times, e.g. in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the rite of consecration to the ministry was looked upon as being brought to its completion when the one ordained first celebrated the Lord's Supper, for it was when the Lord at His own Table put His gifts of bread and wine into his hands, that He fulfilled the act in consecrating His servant to His ministry, as once He consecrated the apostle-disciples at the Last Supper. It is significant therefore that all the early Church consecrations and ordinations of its ministers known to us took place in a Eucharistic context. This is a rite that should still be followed: The act of the Presbytery in ordination should be followed by the celebration of Holy Communion in which the newly ordained person should dispense the Sacrament for the first time. The early C. of S. practice of 'fasting' at ordinations seems to have been derived from the OT rite of the consecration of the priests and their seven-day separation.

B

The Doctrine of Ordination

In gathering up our discussion to present a doctrine of ordination we must consider it from three aspects:

(1) The source of ordination: its derivation from Christ through the ministry of the Church.

(2) The end of ordination: that to which a man is ordained determines the nature of ordination.

(3) What the act of ordination means and how it is carried out.

(1) *The Source of ordination*

Who is it who ordains a man to the ministry? In answer to that question we have to give the unambiguous answer, Jesus Christ Himself. Ordination is His act, and it is His authority that stands behind it, and therefore it can be done only in His Name. But Christ ordains within His Church which He founded upon the Apostles and it is through that Church that He acts. Here we are confronted with a fundamental duality, but it is also the fundamental duality of Revelation. Revelation is the act of Christ which is brought to bear upon us directly through His Spirit, but it is revelation which He communicates to us through the Holy Scriptures. The Risen and Ascended Lord has bestowed His Spirit upon the Church, but the Spirit utters to us what Christ has already said: He does not speak of Himself and does not teach us anything new, but takes what Christ has already revealed and leads us fully into its Truth. The Church is thus bound to the NT Scriptures but in and through the NT Scriptures the risen and ascended Lord communicates Himself directly to His Church in the communion of the Spirit. So it is with Ordination. It is the Risen and Ascended Lord who acts directly through His Spirit ordaining His servant to the ministry, but He does that in and through the Church which He has once and for all established in the Apostles and bound to the Revelation which He has committed to the Church through the Apostles. The Church is bound to act in obedience to the Apostolic teaching and commands, and through them it is bound to the historical Jesus Christ. When the Church from age to age ordains men to the ministry in the Name of Christ, it does that only within that obedience to the Apostolic teaching and ordinances, and only within the sphere

of the Apostolic commission and mission given to the Apostles by Christ in founding the Church. That duality is apparent already in the NT Church. It is the Risen and Ascended Lord who bestows gifts upon the Church through the Spirit, but these gifts are bestowed for exercise within the one Church founded upon the Apostles and within the sphere of their Commission by Christ. The Apostles appointed the rite of the laying on hands to mark out and delimit the sphere of their commission, and to attest the propriety of a ministry within that sphere. That laying on of hands cannot be regarded as determining or delimiting the sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit, for although Christ has bound the Church to its foundation in the Apostles, He is Himself sovereignly free over the Apostles as the risen and ascended Lord. The laying on of hands cannot be understood therefore as securing or guaranteeing the presence or the operation of the Holy Spirit, but as the apostolically given sign witnessing to the presence of the Spirit, attesting the obedience of the Church to its apostolic origins and binding its continuance, and the continuance of its ministry, within the sphere of the Apostolic commission and authority. It is Christ, not the Apostles, nor the Church, who bestows upon the ordained minister the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit for the exercise of his office; nevertheless it is clear that the laying on of hands was given by the Apostles with the promise of Christ to impart spiritual gifts for the fulfilment of the ministry. Ordinarily and normatively we are to understand the laying on of hands as the apostolically appointed sign and instrument used by the Spirit in bestowing the *charisma* for the ministry. Its necessity is one of obedience to the Apostolic ordinance, and it attests that the ordination of the ministry derives from the historical Jesus and His historically communicated authority to the Apostles. But the historical Jesus is risen and ascended, and it is He who from generation to generation continues to bestow His Spirit upon the Church and continues to bestow the grace-gifts for the ministry of Word and Sacrament within the Church, and it is He the living Lord who is the actual Ordainer in ordination, although He makes use of the ministers who have been sent by Him already to carry out the ordinance within the Church on earth. It is only in this togetherness of 'the risen Lord' and 'the historical Jesus' who

is one Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Head of the Church, that we must think in ordination. The risen Lord sends us back to the historical Jesus and sends us back always to the commission He gave to the Apostles, so that ordination is through the historical communication of the Apostolic Word and the Apostolic commission—the historical Jesus still commissions His ministers through that external and historical succession, and therefore the historical mediation or communication of ordination is of fundamental importance as attesting the binding of the Church to the historical Jesus and the historical Revelation. The Church which separates itself from the historical Jesus ceases thereby to be Christ's Church, for it cuts itself off from its historical rooting and grounding in the historical Revelation and Incarnation. But within that historical communication it is the risen Lord Himself who ever comes to His Church acting obediently in His Name and Himself ordains. He Himself is really present where we meet in His name to obey His commands, and He fulfils what He promises, and His presence in grace and in the power of His Spirit undergirds all our actions. We rely in every ordination therefore not upon the faithfulness of the Church, nor upon the unbroken nature of the historical succession, for these are all involved in the relativities and contingencies of this fallen world, but upon the faithfulness of Christ who remains with His Church that lives and acts in His Name. It is His covenant-faithfulness undergirding our weakness and faltering faithfulness, and renewing our participation in Him that is the ground of our reliance in every act of ordination.

It is this same fundamental duality in ordination, ordination by the Risen Lord and by the Church in history within the sphere of the Apostolic Commission, that gives the concept of 'the validity of orders' its elusive ambiguity. Validity must refer absolutely to the fact that it is Christ the Lord who ordains, and that whenever He ordains He ordains to ministry in the Church of God, He it is who honours that ministry as His own gift to the Church and makes it efficacious through His Spirit. But validity also refers to the responsible transmission of authorisation from generation to generation attesting the obedience of the Church in all its ordinations to the Apostolic teaching and ordinances. Because this involves historical com-

munication and responsible action it involves a duly intended and orderly act of ordination. It cannot be given in abstraction from the ordering of a Church's life, from its discipline and polity. Thus validity has also a juridical aspect, in which the term is relative to the legal structure of a Church in history. It refers to the responsible authorisation of a Church in history, which orders its life and discipline in obedience to the Apostolic Church, and therefore is bound up with the lawful way of administering life and discipline in that Church. Thus in the Church of Scotland we ordain a man to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of God, because we believe it is Christ Himself who ordains, but in ordination the Church (through its authorised ministers) commits to him due authorisation to minister the Word and Sacraments within the discipline of the Church of Scotland within which he also promises at ordination to be subject to the Church. But the Church of Scotland does not thereby claim that, in that sense of authorisation, it has authorised its ministers to administer the Word and Sacraments in every other Church. It does not necessarily acknowledge the authorisation of those ordained in other Churches as giving them authority to administer the Word and Sacraments in the Church of Scotland—but it does not for that reason question the validity of their orders in the other sense that their ordination is an act of Christ and is honoured by Him in making their ministry efficacious. The Church of Scotland does claim however that in obedience to the teaching and ordinance of the Apostles 'the laying on of hands of the presbytery' is the proper and responsible way of ordaining the ministry and of transmitting in the historical communication of the Church due authorisation for ministry of Word and Sacraments within the sphere of the Apostolic commission and mission. While it acknowledges that authorisation for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments is inescapably bound up with the discipline of the Church of Scotland and is therefore relative to its Church structure and law, it claims that its careful and orderly transmission of ordination from generation to generation is in full conformity to the Apostolic ordinance and teaching, and therefore reaches beyond what is merely relative to the particular legal institutions of the Church of Scotland itself.

(2) *The end of ordination*

Ordination means ordination to the ministry of Word and Sacraments, that is to dispensing Word and Sacraments. Strictly, therefore, 'ordination' should only be used for the order of those who dispense the Word and Sacraments. It is using ordination in a somewhat loose sense to speak of ordaining deacons or deaconesses or ordaining elders, for they are not ordained to *dispense* the Word and Sacraments but are set apart or consecrated to *assist* in that ministry, even although a rite of laying on of hands may be used. A rite of laying on of hands is used also in some baptismal rites or in confirmations, but it does not therefore mean that those who have hands laid on them are ordained—what determines ordination is the end to which ordination is directed and intended by the Church. This involves two important points.

(*a*) That which a man is ordained to minister, the Word and Sacraments, is more important than ordination. Ordination is in order to the Word and Sacraments, and therefore ordination is subordinate to the Word and Sacraments which it serves. In other words the ministering of Word and Sacraments is subservient to the Word and Sacraments themselves. The ministry is but an earthen vessel, as St. Paul put it, but it contains the heavenly treasure, and must never be confounded with the heavenly treasure. Therefore in the ministering of the Word and Sacraments, the mysteries of God, the ministering itself must be dependent upon that which is ministered and can never exalt itself over it. Ordination does not give the minister authority over the Word and Sacraments, but sets him in a servant-relation to them. They are always transcendent to the ministry and their efficacy cannot be tied to the ministry or only be relative to the worth of the ministers. The very authority which a minister has for ministering Word and Sacraments lies in the Word and Sacraments and not in himself —that is another way of saying that the ministry is at every point dependent upon the Apostolic Word and Ordinances, for it is through the Apostles that we have committed to us the Word and Sacraments and only in obedience to the Apostolic ordering of the ministry that we administer them.

(*b*) There can in the nature of the case be no higher ministry

than that of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, for that would be to suppose that there was a higher authority than that of the Word and a higher sanction than that of the Seals of the Word directly instituted and given by Jesus Christ. If ordination is defined by its end in the ministry of Word and Sacrament, and Word and Sacrament are more important than the ministering of them, it follows that there is only one order of the ministry in the proper sense, that of the minister dispensing Word and Sacraments. The order of the presbyteral ministry is not only the highest order, but in the strict sense the only order of the ministry. Other so-called orders are either for the assistance of this order or for the convenience of maintaining unity and concord and discipline among those so ordained. The fact that there is only one order of the ministry in the strict sense, is the meaning of the so-called parity of ministers in a Presbyterian Church, but this does not preclude distinctions in jurisdiction either in the Church Courts to which presbyters are subject or among presbyters themselves. Thus as Calvin says, 'The political distinction of ranks [i.e. distinctions in Church polity, not 'politics'] is not to be repudiated, for natural reason itself dictates this in order to take away confusion; but that which shall have this object in view, will be so arranged that it may neither obscure Christ's glory nor minister to ambition or tyranny, nor prevent all ministers from cultivating mutual fraternity with each other, with equal rights and liberties' (*Comm. on Num.* 3.5). There can therefore be no doctrinal grounds for any distinction between a presbyter and a bishop or a presbyter-bishop, nor any ground at all for a distinction in order, though there may well be ecclesiastical or historical grounds for making a partial distinction in function and therefore for adding some measure of jurisdiction to one presbyter to enable him responsibly to fulfil that extra function. But such a distinction in function could not make a bishop more of a minister or give him a higher ministry in relation to Word and Sacrament than that of every other presbyter. The doctrine of parity of ministers must not therefore be confused with differences in function or relative distinctions in jurisdiction. Thus in the Reformed Church we acknowledge that some presbyters are set apart and acknowledged to have a special *charisma* for teaching doctrine and for keeping a 'watching

brief' over the purity of the Church's proclamation and doctrine in obedience to the teaching of the Apostles. These are the 'doctors' of the Church, and they are responsibly commissioned to exercise their functions with appropriate jurisdiction, not in their case in Church or pastoral government, and so they are not given ecclesiastical jurisdiction of any kind, but in the teaching and training of the ministry and in doctrine. That does not in any way do away with 'the parity of ministers' in the sense that the doctors have a higher ministry or a superior order to other presbyters. The same would apply to the 'bishop-in-presbytery', although in that case where his special function would be concerned with pastoral discipline, he would naturally be set apart for that in the appropriate way by the Presbytery, in 'the laying on of hands by the Presbytery' so keeping him under its own authority, but commissioning him to act responsibly for it in the ways the Church would lay down. Here the nature of 'the laying on of hands' would be determined by the end intended and determined by the Church. In this instance it would not be determined by the Word and Sacraments, but by something else, a function to act as spiritual counsellor and guide to his fellow-ministers, and to act in a presidential capacity or even a representative capacity for the Presbytery in its solemn acts and deliberations. But because the bishop-in-presbytery could be given no higher relation to the Word and Sacraments—that is in the nature of the case impossible—he could have no higher order than that of his fellow-presbyters.

(3) *What ordination is and how it is carried out*

Ordination is the solemn setting apart to the ministry of Word and Sacraments of a man who has been called to that ministry. It is an act in which the whole Church concurs, although the act of ordination itself is carried through by those who have already been ordained, for they only are the proper instruments for 'regular' association of others with the commission they have received and which they in obedience to the apostolic ordinance devolve upon others. It is not that they thus transmit 'grace' or the Holy Spirit; nor that they transmit divine authority, but in so doing they attest that it is Christ alone who acts, and they make evident that they are acting

only in obedience to Christ's own commissioned Apostles. But as we have already noted the act of ordination is also the lawful act in the discipline of the Church where responsibility in office is devolved in an orderly way upon others in succession to their fathers in the same office. It is an act that takes place in space and time, in the space or place of the Church where Christ has put His Name on earth, the visible Church, and in the time or historical continuity of the Church which Christ has sent out into history to proclaim the Gospel of His Kingdom until He comes again. Thus the physical, visible and temporal action in ordination attests the binding of the Church to the physical, visible and temporal Incarnation and the Church once and for all founded by the Incarnate Son in the Apostles and Prophets. Just as the Church's life and worship is neither timeless nor spaceless, but in the historical and risen Jesus Christ, so the act of ordination is not a spaceless and timeless act in which the visible and temporal element is of no importance.

On the other hand the act of ordination is not a Sacrament in the proper sense—although Calvin himself was not averse to calling it a Sacrament. It is certainly not a 'Sacrament of the Gospel', that is a sign and seal of a saving ordinance through which salvation is bestowed in the unity of Word and appointed Sign, but because ordination is the appointed ordinance, with its accompanying and appropriate sign, for the ordering of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, it necessarily partakes of the sacramental character of the Word and Sacraments, and is rightly performed only within the Church as the Body of Christ, within the Covenant-signs-and-seals of the Church's incorporation into Christ. No unbaptised person can ordain or be ordained, for no uncovenanted person can be commissioned within the ministry of the New Covenant, and no one who is not himself a communicant member of the Church can ordain or be ordained, for no one who has not himself shared in the communion of the New Covenant and in the self-consecration of Christ sealed upon His own at the Holy Supper can be a consecrated minister of the New Covenant. Just because ordination has this setting within the Church's incorporation into Christ in Word and Sacrament, it must take place in the context of Word and Sacrament, as well as in the context of the Church's solemn judicial action of a sacred court.

This dual aspect of the rite of ordination reflects its dual character. It takes place in and through an act of the Presbytery met and constituted as a sacral court of the Church. Ordination is not properly and validly enacted except by an association of presbyters duly convened within the Church and according to discipline and constitution of the Church by a resolution of the appropriate court as a whole, for it must be an act in which the whole Church concurs and which therefore has the acknowledged authority of the Church. That is the judicial aspect of ordination which has its appropriate ceremonies, such as the interrogation and response, the taking of vows and the signing of the formula in the Church's roll of lawfully commissioned ministers, and the solemn act of laying on of hands which in part is an essential legal act attesting the lawful and responsible bestowal of a commission or the conferring of authority to minister the Word and Sacraments within the bounds of the Church and its mission. This judicial part of ordination is not carried out in and by itself apart, but only within the whole spiritual action of ordination, though it is particularly in the laying on of hands that the overlap between the judicial and the spiritual aspects of ordination is most apparent.

Ordination is primarily a spiritual act within the Church in which Christ Himself is the Principal Agent, and in which the ordained ministers (those preaching presbyters to whom it belongs to act thus in Christ's Name) act as servants of Christ and only in obedience to His commands. The whole act of ordination is therefore dependent upon the Word of God as mediated through the Apostolic tradition. If ordination is by Christ in accordance with His Word, then it is carried out only in 'sacramental' dependence upon His Word—it is the Word which commissions to the ministry, and the Word which is the sole repository of divine authority in the Church which bestows that authority as the Church acts in obedience to it. The Word is the sceptre through which Christ the risen and ascended Lord continues to govern and rule His Church and continues to call men into His ministry and to command them in His service. Ordination takes place therefore in accordance with the Apostolic Warrant, in solemn declaration of the Word, and in the context of the Church meeting to wait upon that Word in

its proclamation through the heralds sent by Christ to the Church. Only when the royal proclamation of the Word of the King has been enunciated does the Church through its ministers act in obedience to it in the ceremony of ordination.

The other parts of this ceremony are prayer and the laying on of hands. *The Westminster Form of Church-Government* puts the laying on of hands first, but the *Second Book of Discipline*, following the order of the *First Book of Discipline*, and the teaching of Knox and Calvin, puts prayer first. That indicates that the primary element in ordination is the *epiclesis*, the response of the Church to God's Word made in prayer calling for the bestowal of the Spirit upon him being set apart to the ministry. That indicates that it is Christ Himself who ordains through the sending of His Spirit, and that it is entirely the divine intention and act that determines the nature of the ordinance and its effect. The emphasis upon the act of prayer as an *epiclesis* also makes clear that the formal act of laying on of hands, necessary and important as it is juridically, is not to be regarded mainly as a legal act, but as the Apostolically appointed sign attesting that it is Christ who ordains, that it is the Spirit who acts, and that the rite of ordination has its root and ground beyond in the self-consecration of Christ in His own prayerful self-oblation on our behalf. Within that act of prayer the laying on of hands has its essential and indispensable place. But when it is taken within that act of prayer we must say with Augustine *Quid aliud est manuum impositio quam oratio super hominem?* The imposition of hands is primarily the lifting up of hands in prayer, so that actual tactual laying on of hands is really secondary. On the ground of biblical teaching however in which it is clear that the act of *samakh* was the main ceremonial act we lay stress upon tactual imposition as well as the laying on of hands in blessing, for in the biblical teaching tactual imposition itself is recognised as an act offering and presenting the one who is the object of laying on of hands to God in dedication and consecration for His service. It is because of this extremely close relation between laying on of hands in prayerful offering and the lifting up of hands in prayer in blessing that many of the early books of Church order omit its actual mention for the stress was laid upon the act of prayer and was considered to be implied in it. That was

the attitude of John Knox in 1560 although in 1572 if not actually earlier the imposition of hands was restored in detailed action and has ever since been regarded as indispensable in the Church of Scotland.

Accompanying and preceding the act of ordination there are other rites which have their proper place and are designed to attest the fact that the person ordained is acknowledged as one who has himself received a divine call to the Holy Ministry, that his own private recognition of that call is confirmed by the Church acting through its duly constituted Courts, and confirmed by the congregation which has called him to be its minister in the Name of Christ. The act of ordination thus requires the imprimatur of the Church as a whole and the acclaim and acquiescence of the local congregation who also take vows in support of the minister and in obedience to the fact that their minister has been sent to them by Christ Himself. The minister himself takes vows which bind him to the continuity of the Church's obedience to the Apostles in doctrine and ordinances, and in which he solemnly promises to fulfil His ministry with devotion to Christ as His servant, without lording it over the flock to seek their good in the Lord. At the same time he acknowledges that the government of the Church is agreeable to the Word of God, promises to be subject to its discipline, to take his due part in its affairs, and to seek the unity and peace of the Church. But in undertaking these vows, as in the administration of ordination to him, the Church makes it clear that the minister acts not on his own charges or on his own resources, but only in the *command* and therefore only in reliance upon the *promise* of Jesus Christ who remains the same yesterday, today, and for ever, and who never fails to keep His Word.

THE PROBLEM OF REALISM IN R. NIEBUHR'S CHRISTOLOGY

by Professor J. M. LOCHMAN

When the Swedish theologian George Hammar in his study of Reinhold Niebuhr tried to formulate concisely the standpoint of this religious thinker, he did so in the very words he used in the title 'Christian Realism'.[1] He thus employed a term which is used elsewhere to characterise Niebuhr's theological thinking and which is a favourite with Niebuhr himself. This term, of course, is used so often in current theological discussions and with so many different associations, as to have become rather ambiguous and vague. The use of it here does not aspire to anything more than to indicate roughly the theology which tries to show its disagreement with ethical idealism in 'Christian practice' and with idealistic religious philosophy in 'Christian theory'. Both ethical and metaphysical idealism belong as a rule to the outfit of the modernistic, liberal philosophy of religion (where in some form or other it is proclaimed as a fitting and saving interpretation of Christianity for the modern man), but so-called Christian realism is opposed to a substantial part of the heritage of liberal theology. It is from this perspective then that the work of Reinhold Niebuhr is to be judged, as is agreed by the majority of his biographers and as follows from his own formulations of his programme.

The first task of a critical appraisal of Niebuhr's thinking is therefore, to trace the direction and the outcome of his quest for realism. If such an appraisal is to be *theological* it must be done from the viewpoint of *biblical* realism, that is, in confrontation with and in orientation towards the *res* of the objectively given Word of God to which the Scriptures testify. Such an appraisal is the purpose of this article, in concentrating on what is evidently the most burning problem of Niebuhr's theological and religio-philosophical work, on his Christology. Here we enter upon ground which has not yet been covered by a monograph on his part (in contrast, for example, to anthropology).

[1] *Christian Realism in Contemporary American Theology*, Uppsala 1940.

If we enter upon this ground, it is not because of a bias or prejudice, but because of a conviction that it is always and above all Christology which provides the decisive criterion of Christian thinking. Thus the attempt to follow Niebuhr's progress in solving the Christological problem by showing the directions and the limits of his realism, will go far to answer the question as to Niebuhr's place in contemporary theology.

I

The beginning of Niebuhr's Christological thinking may be found in his first-fruit *Does Civilisation Need Religion?* (1929). This was but a modest beginning. Niebuhr himself wrote a few years later with self-criticism that it obviously contained all the 'theological windmills' against which he now fights vigorously.[1] In it he revolts against the bourgeois caricature of Jesus' Gospel, in its ethical and especially social implications,[2] nevertheless, he still accepts in his philosophy of religion the basic thesis of liberal modernism. This may also be said of his rudimentary 'Christology'. His portrait of Christ is obviously formed in typical modernistic categories. In agreement with these as they have been formulated especially in the Anglo-Saxon (as contrasted with continental) Churches, his relationship towards Jesus Christ is intentionally positive. Again in line with the typical practice of modernistic Christology, he deforms the biblical message by adapting it to his own thought-assumptions. Thus his positively interpreted Jesus Christ serves by His recognised authority as a seal to the programme which the thinker espouses. The Christ of Niebuhr's early work looks therefore surprisingly like the realisation of Niebuhr's own programme that is, as a Radical in ethics, who by His very being puts a question mark to the whole conventional morality of bourgeois civilisation, and as a liberal in religious philosophy who is free from dogmatic claims and not bound by the discredited absurdities of an outworn creed. It is *such* a Christ who is needed to save our civilisation.

Our civilisation *needs* this Christ. If we free the personality

[1] *Christian Century*, 1939, p. 542.

[2] Niebuhr's experience of pastoral work in the 'classical city of capitalism', Detroit, which appeared to him as literal hell, brought him to offer a sharp criticism of the socio-ethical idealism and reformism of the Social Gospel theology thus still influential.

of Jesus Christ from the speculative accretions which blurred His image in the Christological dogma, then we can penetrate to the 'real genius' of the life of Christ, which does not have its centre in cult and speculation but in the realism of moral and social action. Thus a revised Christology may continue to be a spring of mighty moral and religious inspiration. Thus a departure from the Christological dogma is not for Niebuhr a departure from the 'Christ idea', especially since it is this very idea which gives the Christian message its 'dramatic force and concretion'. It is particularly its symbolism which makes it so valuable: 'When dealing with life-ultimates symbolism is indispensable, and a symbolism which has a basis in historic incident is most effective. The idea of a potent but yet suffering divine ideal which is defeated by the world but gains its victory in the defeat must remain basic in any morally creative world view' (op. cit., p. 236).

Such is then the place of Christology at the starting point of Niebuhr's quest. Because its symbolism is especially effective in awakening the loyalty of believers (just as the symbolism of a flag awakens the loyalty of patriots), and because it expresses adequately the cosmic and human situation in its dynamic tension, it can be well used even by that regenerated religion of which civilisation stands in need. The pragmatic view-point which is behind Niebuhr's reflections indicates that in this realm faith cannot be thought of as basically and organically bound up with the actual Jesus Christ of whom the Gospel testifies. Quite obviously Niebuhr's Jesus is 'the idea of a divine ideal' and a symbol of a general anthropological and even cosmic situation, not a real revelation of God, a concrete, unique revelation and restoration of the nature and destiny of man. It will be well to keep in mind this approach to Christological problems even for a later—often very different—development of Niebuhr's Christology.

II

A new and distinctive era in Niebuhr's Christological understanding is represented by his penetrating literary works from the thirties, especially by his *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (1935) and by his essays *Beyond Tragedy* (1937). In these may be seen the substantial progress he made on the way from the

general liberal religious philosophy of his early work towards the Christian realism which came to characterise his most important works. Evidence for this may be found in his Christology.

Henceforth Niebuhr criticises very strongly the liberal Christological schemes which he had, on the whole, accepted earlier and especially the idea that Christ was 'the ideal man, whom all men can emulate, once *the persuasive charm of* His life has captivated their souls'.[1] This humanising conception of the 'historical Christ' must be judged inadequate and false not only on the grounds of biblical Christology but above all from the viewpoint of realistic anthropology and ethics. In the background there lies an idealistic and optimistic conception of man, who is in the last resort self-sufficient and who is capable (in the essence of his humanity reached in Christ) of being himself the ultimate ideal and norm. However, such a picture (a typical product of the liberal bourgeois mentality of the nineteenth century) misrepresents the 'total human situation'. By the inner dimension of his humanity, man transcends every historical plane and cannot be bound to the ideal man Jesus as his final norm. In the realm of ethics—which is especially dear to Niebuhr—it means: the law of love which according to the biblical message Jesus Christ formulates and incarnates is far beyond the only human possibility of the 'historical Christ'; it is an absolute, that is, a super-historical norm. Although it is rightly relevant to all our decisions in history, it cannot be wholly realised even by the greatest moral heroism in history. Thus there is in the human situation both more and less than was imagined by the all too simple anthropology which is at the background of liberal Christology. *More*: human life has 'infinite possibilities' and its norm cannot be merely historical. And *less*: man in his corruption always falls short of the ideal even when he reaches his highest. By its lineality the humanizing conception of Jesus disturbs this dialectic of human existence.

And it is this dialectic which has some justice done to it by traditional Christology. 'The Christ of Christian orthodoxy [is] true mythical symbol of both the possibilities and the limits of the human' (op. cit., p. 15). The message about Christ, the

[1] *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, New York 1935, p. 119.

Son of God, clearly reminds us that the last dimension of truth and love, the perfect normative life, is beyond the possibility of our empirical humanity; at the same time, the message about Christ, the Second Adam, underlines the fact that this form of truth and love is nevertheless relevant to our whole human reality. Thus the orthodox teaching about Jesus Christ does full justice to the basic dialectic nature of human existence.[1] It can be applied universally. Niebuhr exploits its helpful symbolism in many connexions: in ethics, in the philosophy of history, in his essays about the relation of time and eternity, in the teaching about Providence, etc. The frequent use of Christological terminology and the ever deepening relation to the Christological problems in Niebuhr's thinking in the thirties testifies to a growing sense of the message of the positive Christian tradition. Niebuhr accepts, obviously very willingly, its various single elements which capture him, above all, by their realism and profound anthropological insights. His progress towards Christian realism cannot be doubted. Nevertheless, just there, where we witness this remarkable tendency, we find, at the same time, traces of a methodological approach which make it questionable from a theological point of view. I am thinking especially of the symbolism of Niebuhr's Christology. Its formulations point again and again in this direction: we find in Jesus Christ an illustration, a reflection of the general problems of anthropology and ethics rather than a unique and concrete event in which the real God in the real man intervenes in our history. The emphasis is not on the 'unique' (Jesus Christ) in whose light is to be regarded the 'general' (anthropology), but rather on this 'general' which is then only 'symbolised' by the 'unique'. But this approach is quite contrary to the biblical one. Here then is to be found the first shortcoming of Niebuhr's Christology.

This has a further result: the symbolical approach stands in his way towards biblical realism also in the sense that his Christological statements move rather in the region of 'ideas' than of realities. They are significant by their general meaning and not by the concrete object of their message. Here then we

[1] 'Christ, who expresses both the infinite possibilities of love in human life and the infinite possibilities beyond human life, is thus a true revelation of the total situation in which human life stands' (*Beyond Tragedy*, London 1944, p. 17).

find ourselves at the frontier of religious idealism dressed up as 'realism' and in the Christological sphere we are near a certain form of 'docetism'. It seems to me that Niebuhr did not steer free of this danger in his 'mythical' and 'symbolical' Christology. In spite of all his extraordinary historical sense, his sense of the reality of the incarnation is somehow vague.[1] He accepts the symbolism of 'God-man' and even the 'myth of Christ' and 'the idea of transcendent Christ'. But he has nothing to say about His concrete reality. And here is to be found the second shortcoming of Niebuhr's Christological realism.

III

The culminating point of Niebuhr's thinking so far is, without doubt, to be found in his two volumes of Gifford Lectures—*The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1941-3). Here he gathered, elaborated and unfolded all the basic motives of his thinking. Christology also is more fully dealt with here. Not separately but in connexion with anthropological interpretation and above all in connexion with essays about the meaning of history which is, of course, significant for Niebuhr's approach to Christology. However, he does deal with the subject at greater length and with greater concentration than ever before.

The Gifford Lectures do not bring essentially new conceptions; they are rather variations on old themes. The basic position of 'symbolic Christology' remains intact: the revision of the Liberal conception of Christ, a growing sense for the orthodox tradition and its symbolical interpretation. All this has been mentioned above. But there is another complex of questions which must be looked to: it is Niebuhr's attempt to revalue and reconstruct critically the Christological dogma. Here at last we find not simply casual remarks bearing upon Christology but concentrated and conscious effort to deal with Christological problems.

According to Niebuhr, the orthodox dogma holds in contrast to the Liberal conception a basic truth when it asserts that Jesus Christ is the fulness but also the transcendent norm of humanity. But even this dogma misrepresents the final truth

[1] Cf. his statement in *ICE*: 'The Christian believes that the ideal of love is real in the will and nature of God, even though he knows of no place in history where the ideal has been realised in its pure form' (p. 8).

when it tries to express the symbolic and dialectical truth about the revelation of God in Christ in the terms of Greek metaphysics. 'This means, in effect, that an ultimate truth, transcending all human wisdom and apprehended by faith, is transmuted into a truth of human wisdom and incorporated into a metaphysical system.'[1] In spite of all the good will of the old theologians the theory about the double nature of Christ is unfortunate: 'By stating this double facet of Christ in "ontic" terms, a truth of faith, which can be expressed only symbolically, is transmuted into a truth of speculative reason' (op. cit., p. 63). The result from the logical standpoint is nonsense: while it is possible to imagine that a certain historical personality points symbolically above history and becomes thus a source of unveiling the eternal meaning and power which support history it is not possible 'for any person to be historical and unconditioned at the same time'.[2]

The defect of Christological dogma is, of course, not to be sought in its essence, that is, in the meaning of its teaching, but in its speculative form. For this reason an effort which attempts to say the old truths in a new form is legitimate and hopeful. Niebuhr makes this effort with great energy, both in his Gifford Lectures and in other occasional utterances. The essential truth of the message of the Church about the divinity and humanity of Christ he tries to express as 'the paradoxical relation of a divine *agape*, which stoops to conquer, and the human *agape* which rises above history in a sacrificial act' (op. cit., p. 74). To understand fully the theological and philosophical meaning of these important words, it is necessary to realise their background. The concepts 'the ideal of love', 'the law of love', '*agape*', etc., are for Niebuhr since the publication of his Ethics not only ethical but even more clearly ontological conceptions. Love is, of course, above all a *norm* of all life. At the same time, however, it is also a maintaining

[1] *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, London 1943, p. 62.

[2] It seems to me that this criticism of the Christological dogma is justified only partly. Niebuhr is right when he protests against the speculative tendencies which so quietly penetrated into Christian theology. But is Christological dogma to be regarded simply as a manifestation of these tendencies? Is it not on the contrary a necessary historical defence against speculation which then threatened the Christian confession? Not only is the conscious 'logical absurdity' of this teaching a confirmation that it is not the product of the speculative reason but rather is it a barrier against a more logical—and therefore unacceptable—simplification.

and basic *reality*, naturally not undifferentiated but dialectical. Its dialectical character can be detected in the fact that on the one hand it is behind the general, natural structures of reality, but that on the other hand it transcends them. Sometimes Niebuhr formulates its dialectic in trinitarian terminology. As God the Father, love is the divine power which is the basis of all creation; it is then truly the immanent law of reality, which operates in the world in spite of being continually obscured by sin. As God the Son, love is a transcendent redemption and a consummation of reality, which is beyond the possibility of this world. As the *Creator* God is behind the immanent cosmic order where His judgments are to be seen in the functioning of its structures; while as the *Redeemer* He is free from all dependence on His order and on these structures, as He shows when in the abundance of His mercy, He even takes upon Himself our judgment.

This basic ontological dialectic can be seen especially in anthropology: *agape* is, on the one side, the source of all human life; even natural human life carries in itself her marks (ambiguous because of sin but still real). But *agape* is at the same time a perfection which transcends human life and which can be recognised only by a special revelation.

Here then we are in the immediate vicinity of Niebuhr's Christology. In this dialectical state of things Christology is, on the one side, introduced in the general anthropological situation, which on the other side it clarifies by transcending its limits and possibilities. In epistemology it means: the message about Jesus Christ 'is thus a doctrine which hovers between natural and revealed religion. It belongs to the natural religion in the sense that any rigorous analysis of the moral life of man will partially disclose the tensions towards the eternal in all morality. It belongs to revealed religion because it is not possible, without faith, to follow these implications through to their final logical conclusion' (op. cit., p. 79). Between these two sources there is a tension but not a contradiction. The connecting link between the truth naturally perceived and truth revealed is a certain *analogia caritatis*, which is also the cord binding God and His creation. This analogy, so rich in its content, is now exploited abundantly by Niebuhr in his Christological reconstruction.

As has been shown above, Niebuhr tries to interpret the sense of the Christian message about Jesus Christ in a more satisfactory way than that offered by traditional Church teaching, by pointing to the dialectical relation between divine and human *agape*. He wants to interpret the 'metaphysical dogma' about the two natures of Christ in 'more personal ethical concepts'. He seeks the basis of such a more satisfactory concept for example in the biblical message that in Christ we have a High Priest, who was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb. 4.15). This conception of Jesus' sinlessness as an integral part of His real humanity, as well as an emphatic reference to the fact that He who realised this humanly 'impossible possibility' is more than man, (excellently) depicts, according to Niebuhr, the basic dialectical character of our situation. It is anthropologically relevant and for that reason more comprehensible to the modern man than metaphysical concepts. Thus the message about the sinlessness of Christ 'makes the doctrine that Jesus was both human and divine religiously and morally meaningful and dispenses with the necessity of making the doctrine metaphysically plausible' (op. cit., p. 73). So far as formulations are still needed it is possible to be satisfied with quite simple pronouncements such as the following: 'The *agape* of Christ is the disclosure of both the divine love which bears history and the human love which is history's "impossible possibility"' (op. cit., p. 79). This simple ascertainment contains the sum total of Christology. Whatever goes beyond this, may be from the evil one.

In this way then Niebuhr tries to reconstruct the Christological dogma in ethical terms. What does he claim to be his positive contribution? Along with an increased ethical and anthropological relevance Niebuhr underlines above all the conquest of 'logical absurdity'. While metaphysical speculations which have their starting point in the absolute distance between divine and human nature lead to insufferable antinomies, in 'symbolical Christology' the paradoxical relation between divine and human love can be understood without difficulty. Here the starting point is not the absolute difference between divine and human natures but their dialectical continuity, although in Niebuhr's view this does not superficially harmonise the natural and revealed world, nevertheless, it does

not see between the two any gulf which could not be bridged from the human side. In this dialectical bridging of the metaphysical gulf between the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, Niebuhr sees a way out of the futile paradoxes of traditional teaching: a way to a fuller and more vital comprehension of the biblical truth about Jesus Christ.

Let us add a few critical remarks. I have already tried to formulate in connexion with the second stage of Niebuhr's work some fundamental reservations. They are, it seems to me, applicable to the culminating stage of his thought also. Both the above-mentioned limits of Christological realism in Niebuhr's thinking are apparent here also.

It is above all the secondary place given to Christology in Niebuhr's thought, i.e. the dependence of Christology on primary anthropological and other assumptions, which marks out also his latest efforts. It is not difficult to see that his attempt to reconstruct Christological dogma is hindered by this easy approach. Apparently simple statements are full of quiet assumptions, not only anthropological and ethical but even ontological assumptions. The relation between Christ's divinity and the humanity is formulated in terms which have been determined in advance by Niebuhr's view of the general world structure. The dialectical analogy of love is the key idea both in his ontology and in his Christology. For Niebuhr Christology is relevant so far as it explains this view of world and of man. In so far as it contradicts this it is rejected. It would appear that even the Christological dogma is criticised not so much because it involves logical absurdities but rather because it does not fit into Niebuhr's presuppositions by its vigorous distinction of the divine and human natures. It is right here that we see the principal discrepancy between the biblical message about Jesus Christ and this theory: biblical Christology is never primarily a cosmological explanation or a postulate of anthropology; on the contrary, it is Christology which gives cosmology and anthropology their inner reason, their meaning.

In addition to this primary limitation of Niebuhr's realism —obviously it is not the '*res*' of the Bible message which is its unambiguous starting point—there is also the other: here again Niebuhr concentrates on the ideal meaning of the Gospel

rather than on its concrete reality. It is especially when he is to say what the Church taught when it confessed that 'God was in Christ' that his pronouncements do not rise above vague general formulations such as: 'The significance of the affirmation that God is revealed in Christ, and more particularly in His Cross, is that the love (*agape*) of God is conceived in terms which make the divine involvement in history a consequence of precisely the divine transcendence over the structures of history' (op. cit., p. 74). This is not the only example to be found. Nothing else can be expected when we consider the assumptions of his 'symbolical Christology' which always tend to translate the concrete biblical pronouncements into a paradigm of things in general. The idealistic—docetic—tendency of philosophising theology thus prevails to the very end, representing the other unconquered limitations which keep Niebuhr back from true theological realism.

In view of these two limitations, the concrete endeavour of Niebuhr to do justice to the Christological dogma is theologically unconvincing. The *attempt* to formulate the *kerygma* about Jesus Christ in new terms and in a manner more comprehensible to our generation, must be evaluated positively. A faithful theology conscious of its missionary responsibility must never give this up. Undoubtedly, even the truth of the Christological dogma can be freshly expressed. The foolishness of the Cross is not necessarily identical with the 'foolishness' of the thought-forms of this dogma. Niebuhr's endeavour is very remarkable in this respect. But from the perspective of biblical theology his concrete solution cannot be evalued so positively. The price paid for a more plastic and to the modern man more comprehensible formulation of the fundamental meaning of history is too high. It dims the concrete (realistic!) core of the biblical message. From a theologically justified distrust of the 'foolishness' of other human efforts to formulate the truth of Jesus Christ he went further: to an idealistic transformation of 'the foolishness of the Cross'. And here his attempt fails even more than that of the traditional Church teaching, both formally and materially. *Formally*, he has made no advance upon the old theologians: in resisting the metaphysical intonation of their Christology, he did not rely, with a more consistent theological realism, on the biblical message

but—and there is certain irony in it—on his own 'metaphysics'. *Materially*, from the biblical viewpoint, he has definitely registered a minus. The orthodox dogma, in spite of all the weak points of its conceptual apparatus, testifies more clearly to the primacy, uniqueness and concreteness of God's act in Christ. In its formulation the reality of the message obviously breaks through the thought-forms which seek to capture it in ontological concepts, and by its logical absurdity points to the fact that more than myths, ideas and symbols of this world is to be met here. In this Niebuhr did not succeed. His own thought-presuppositions imprison his Christology in the sphere of immanent anthropological and cosmological problematics. It must be said that in this sphere his thought is deep and his interpretation in particular details is often very stimulating and inspiring. Many weak points of liberal theology are really overcome by him. But the theological foundations are equivocal. In the central biblical message about Jesus Christ, Niebuhr's thinking does not always recognise its *crisis* but seeks there sometimes only its own affirmation. But then, of course, no attempt to reach Christian realism can ever be completely successful.

SOME COMMENTS ON PROFESSOR HICK'S ARTICLE ON 'THE CHRISTOLOGY OF D. M. BAILLIE'

by The Very Rev. Professor JOHN BAILLIE

I was naturally very much interested by Professor Hick's generous appreciation and lucidly argued criticism, in the March number, of my brother's views; but since I have been inclined to accept these latter very fully, I am most anxious to understand the exact point of their divergence from those now advanced by Professor Hick.

(1) My brother's suggestion was that what he called the paradox of grace 'points the way more clearly and makes a better approach than anything else in our experience to the mystery of the Incarnation itself'; so that he was led to ask, 'If the paradox is a reality in our poor imperfect lives at all, so far as there is any good in them, does not the same paradox, taken at the perfect and absolute pitch, appear as the mystery of the Incarnation?' Professor Hick's main criticism is that, while on such a view God was indeed in Christ 'in far higher degree' than in other men and 'to a unique extent', on the other hand 'the Nicene and Chalcedonian position is that God was in Christ in a unique sense which is not approximated or paralleled in the case of any other human life'. I have, however, heard my brother say that it is misleading in such a connexion to rely too much on the familiar distinction between degree and kind (or sense), because the absolute and perfect differs from the imperfect and relative not merely in degree but in kind, just as infinity and eternity are no mere prolongation of the finite and temporal, but belong to another order of being. That is to say, when a difference of degree is 'taken at the absolute pitch', it is already a difference of kind. My brother's view then appears not very different from that of his teacher and mine, Professor H. R. Mackintosh, of which the following may serve as an example:

> Fidelity to moral fact, then, obliges us to emphasise, as a fundamental principle, that Divine immanence is essentially a matter of degree. . . .

One true mode of describing Christ, accordingly, is to speak of His person as representing the *absolute immanence* of God. For the Divine indwelling must vary in quality and intensity with the receptiveness of man; hence as it deepens it must from time to time involve new departures, turning-points, crises of an epoch-making character. Of these the life of Christ is the last and the highest. He opens a new order; we may certainly put it so if we add that in this new order He is unique. And by using the term 'immanence' we mark the fact that even in Christ the influx of Godhead is not unrelated to the past. For God has been coming to men from the very beginning. . . . We see God as it were ever moving on his way to incarnation, moving on by new accesses of self-communication, approaching always nearer to complete personal union. . . . The Divine bends towards the human, and in Jesus is realised the ideal limit of their confluence. . . . But we have spoken of *absolute* immanence; and the emphatic adjective is witness to the fact that in Christ immanence reaches its climax. It is a climax which crowns the series by its likeness to the past and transcends it by singularity and difference. The self-giving of God is wholly present in Jesus. (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 432-6.)

My brother, however, would not claim that these considerations exhausted the 'unique sense' in which God was in Christ. What is it then that remains? Professor Hick can refer us only to the concept of substance, as it appears in the phrase ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί. He admits, however, that this concept is now very difficult for us, and suggests that a better concept may perhaps be found which would be 'dynamic' and not 'static' like this one. This can only mean that the Person of Christ would be construed in the light of His Work, and that is how my brother sought to construe it. The grace God gives to each is adjusted to the task He has given to each to perform; and the difference between God's indwelling in Jesus and His indwelling in the rest of us is best defined in terms of the difference between His Vocation and ours. Only He was sent to be the Saviour of the world. 'We are not called upon', wrote Mackintosh, 'to be for God what Christ was; hence it cannot be our ideal, or anything we can aspire to, that we should become Sons of God in the same sense. To the end, be the acquired likeness what it may, the difference of person and vocation must remain' (op. cit., p. 437). Mackintosh, as is well known, was very critical of the Chalcedonian formula, and not least of its employment of the concept of substance. Speaking of 'the maxim that conceptions of Christ's work and of Himself vary together', he adds: 'If what He does upon us is to effect a quasi-physical change in our

essential manhood . . ., we are naturally led to define His person in terms of substance, not spirit'—which was the mistake of the Chalcedonian divines (p. 323).

It is worth remembering that the same hard-and-fast distinction on which Professor Hick here relies has often been pressed upon us also with reference to the inspiration of Holy Scripture. Was the aid given by the Holy Spirit to the Scriptural authors different in kind from that given to later Christian writers? Were the former inspired in a different sense? But here again the question seems to be wrongly put, making it impossible to return a straight answer. We can only say that they were inspired to the performance of a different task. The vocation of the Scriptural authors was the provision of a sacred tradition for the guidance of all who were to follow. The vocation of later writers has been a different and less exalted one. But the assistance given has in each case been duly adjusted to the office to which they were elected. As it happens, Professor Barr has written something relevant to this in the same number of the *Journal*:

> Can we use the word 'inspiration' usefully? If so, it must be purified from all suggestion of inerrancy and infallibility, and from all teaching that identified the production of the Bible with the revelation of God. . . . Behind the Scripture is the action of God in history, creating and redeeming His people. The Scripture is . . . the response of that people, in witness, in worship, and in the moulding of communal life and individual piety, a response which bears authentic marks of the divine action. Within the total response of the people is that particular aspect of obedience which is the formation of the sacred tradition and eventually its canonisation into 'Scripture'. The guidance of the people in this particular aspect is inspiration. It can usefully be classified with such concepts as Election: as God elects into existence His People, He elects into existence their tradition. (p. 91.)

(2) Professor Hick welcomes the further contention of my brother which he thus summarises: 'The situation is not correctly described by saying that God's mode of being "in Christ" is a supreme instance of His manner of being in all men, but rather the reverse, God's mode of being in us is derivative from His being in Christ. . . . Instead of the mystery of the Incarnation being a case of the paradox of grace in general Christian experience, this itself is a partial reproduction [I think my brother would rather have said reflection] of the

supreme mystery of grace in the Incarnation.' But he argues that this undoubted truth gives no support to my brother's central contention, since 'the paradox of grace upon which Baillie's position is based is a wider phenomenon than the Christian life. It is exemplified in all good deeds, whether wrought by Christ's disciples or others.' Hence 'we are no longer able to relate it causally to the Incarnation. We cannot say that the paradox of grace in other men is derived from or dependent upon its supreme instance in the life of Jesus.'

This argument, however, seems to me invalid. It is surely not only those who have heard the story of Jesus who have benefited by His Incarnation and Atonement; for that would leave out the Old Testament saints, to mention no others. If, in Professor Hick's words, 'we recognise, as we must, the paradox of grace as transcending the boundaries of Christianity', must we not also say that what he calls the 'divine enabling grace' granted within a wider field was something with which Christ had also to do? Professor Hick should notice what my brother says about the pre-existence of Christ: 'From the human life of Jesus on earth we are, paradoxically but inevitably, led backwards to its divine origin and eternal background in heaven, on which it all depended. . . . In that sense it is impossible to do justice to the truth of the Incarnation without speaking of it as the coming into history of the eternally pre-existent Son of God.' (*God Was in Christ*, p. 150.) I think my brother would have said that all the enabling grace that has ever in any age been given to men has proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father and the Holy Spirit.

(3) Professor Hick finally confronts my brother with a dilemma—a dilemma, he says, 'generated by the application to the Incarnation of the paradox of grace. On the one hand the paradox might be viewed as a vehicle of predestination, by which God determined man's choices even while such choices remain, from a human point of view, free and responsible action.' On the other hand, if all predestinarianism is avoided, my brother's line of argument would land him inevitably in 'some form of Adoptionism'. Professor Hick thinks that my brother would not wish to subscribe to the predestinarian view, 'though traces of this predestinarian view appear in Baillie's repeated emphasis upon the priority of the divine element in the paradox

of grace. Speaking of Jesus' continual obedience to God's will, he says that "in the last analysis such human choice is never prevenient or even co-operative, but wholly dependent on the divine prevenience".' He therefore holds that my brother is logically forced into some form of Adoptionist Christology.

But I think my brother *would* have wished to subscribe to such a predestinarian view as Professor Hick would apparently abhor. The latter holds, and suggests that my brother (if pressed) would agree, that 'when, in the mystery of personal freedom, a man does choose rightly, what he has done is to allow the divine grace to operate within him. . . . God is not able (without retracting His gift of freedom) to cause a man to choose rightly, although, when he does so choose, his choice is at once taken up into and is inextricably interpenetrated by the prevenient divine activity.' But the only prevenience here ascribed to God is that He offers His grace prior to man's allowing Him to exercise it, and my brother would certainly have said that that is not enough. There is no particular paradox, no mysterious relation of grace to free-will, about the familiar situation of being offered a good thing by somebody and then deciding to accept it. If nothing more than this is implied, the whole paradox is destroyed. We must surely say not only that God graciously offers us His salvation, but also that only by His grace are we enabled to respond to it. The Christian name for this response is faith, and faith also is 'the gift of God'. This is the true paradox. Elsewhere my brother wrote, 'The divine imperative says to me: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. And yet I cannot make myself love my neighbour. . . . Thus there is a sense in which I am not free to do what I ought to do. There is a moral obligation without "ability" to choose the good. That is why the theologians used to speak so much not only of freedom but also of "ability" and "inability", and that is why they spoke of the *servum arbitrium*. . . . But the central tradition of Christian theology has always taught that it is not in human nature, as we know it on earth, to obey that commandment. We cannot even begin to do it by an exercise of our own wills. We can only do it when grace comes to our aid.' (*The Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 135f.) It is perhaps not surprising that Professor Hick should suspect my brother of leaning too much towards a humanitarian and too

easily non-paradoxical interpretation of the Incarnation, if he attributes to him so humanitarian and so little paradoxical a view of that relation of grace to free-will which he took to be a reflection, and thus a pointer to the understanding, of the union of Godhead and manhood in Christ.

THE CHURCH AS THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW[1]

by The Rev. Professor DAN O. VIA, Jr.

Although it is evident to every student of the New Testament that Matthew has a special interest in the Church, the use of the term 'body of Christ' to describe the Church has been peculiarly associated with Paul. For this reason it seems well to begin by discussing briefly what Paul meant by the concept of body in order to have a working definition of it. We will then endeavour to ascertain whether this idea is also present in Matthew.

It has been widely recognised that Paul was a Hebrew in his anthropology.[2] This means that for Paul the body is something which a person is, not something which a person has. The body is the whole person, the self considered from one point of view (1 Cor. 6.13, 18-20; 7.4, 9.27, 13.3; Rom. 6.12ff, 12.1; Phil. 1.20). Thus when Paul states that the Church is the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12.27; Col. 1.24; Rom. 12.4-5; 1 Cor. 10.16-17) or that Christians are members of Christ (1 Cor. 6.15), he is stating some kind of identity between Christ and the Church.

This fact has led Pauline interpreters to hold that in Paul's thought the Church is the extension of Christ's personality,[3] His *alter ego*,[4] His continuing self-manifestation,[5] or his means of effecting redemption in the world.[6] Ernest Best has opposed

[1] It will be assumed here that form-criticism is correct in asserting that the Gospels reflect their own *Sitz im Leben* as well as that of Jesus. It is not agreed that the Church created most of the gospel material; but certainly the church preserved, interpreted, amplified (and sometimes created) sayings of and stories about Jesus which illuminated its own life. Therefore, what Matthew (which designation in this article means only the author of the first Gospel, whoever he was) says about the disciples (the embryo Church) casts light on his own view of the Church.

[2] Rudolf Bultmann (translated by Kendrick Grobel), *Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1951, I, 194ff. Ernest Best, *One Body in Christ*, London, 1955, p. 75. John A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, Chicago, 1952, p. 28. Clarence T. Craig, *Soma Christou*, *The Joy of Study*, New York, 1951, pp. 74-5.

[3] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*, New York and London, 1951, p. 62. [4] Vincent Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, New York, 1953, p. 101.

[5] E. F. Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, London, 1952, pp. 24, 205.

[6] Elias Andrews, *The Meaning of Christ for Paul*, New York and Nashville, 1949, p. 108.

this line of thought and has shown convincingly that the term 'body of Christ' is a metaphor and that Paul does not ontologically identify the Church with Christ. The Church is also called a temple, a virgin, and an olive tree; but it cannot be ontologically all of these things.[1] In addition, Best has denied that for Paul the Church as the Body of Christ expresses Christ's personality or is used as His instrument in the world.[2] Passages often cited to support the latter view (Col. 1.24, 3.15; Eph. 1.22, 4.15, 5.23-32) seem rather to stress the mutual relationships of love within the Church, the union of the Church with Christ, and Christ's life-giving sustenance of the Church.

Best may be over-zealous at points[3] in resisting the identification of Christ and the Church. It is probably better to admit that paradoxically Paul identifies the Church with Christ—or at least Christ with the Church—when he calls it His Body and distinguishes it from Him when he sets Christ over against the Church as its Head and Saviour (Col. 1.15-18, 2.10, 19; Eph. 1.22-23, 4.15, 5.23, 25-26).[4] Such an approach is consistent with the Old Testament concept which has come to be called usually corporate personality, and this is undoubtedly the background of Paul's thought on this matter. 'Corporate personality' is still perhaps the best term to use, but it should not be thought of as a precise anthropological or ontological doctrine. The idea of corporate personality, as referred to in this article, means the diversified attempt of the Old Testament to deal with the concept of the one and the many (or unity in diversity or diversity in unity).

On the one hand, the Hebrew thinker starts with the whole or totality or species; and the part or individual is seen, not as a section of the species, but as a manifestation or expression of the totality of the whole. The individual Moabite is a revelation of 'Moabithood' just as a cow is a fully qualified representation of 'cowhood'. The soul is not a clearly defined whole but is a force acting wholly in all its parts. It is present in the breath, heart, blood, bones, and kidneys (Ps. 26.2; Joshua 11.11; 1 Kings 15.29; Ezek. 11.19, 36.26; Lev. 17.11;

[1] Ernest Best, op. cit., pp. 98-101.
[2] ibid., pp. 78, 110-11, 157.
[3] ibid., pp. 81-2, 113.
[4] Best is not unmindful of this paradox. See op. cit., pp. 111, 157.

Ps. 6.2-3).[1] Furthermore, the totality of the nature of God may be present in His name, word, or arm (1 Kings 8.27-29; Ps. 107.20; Isa. 55.10-11; Isa. 51.5).[2]

On the other hand we have the relationship between the whole and its parts compared to the relation between the head and the other limbs or between the father and his family. When a council is held, the counsel of the strongest soul present penetrates the souls of the others and bends their wills to his; and in this manner all those present become one heart (Job 29). A soul acts on others and is acted on by others, and this union of souls gets a common will and forms a psychic unity. The word *nephesh* can be used of a group (Gen. 23.8; Num. 11.6, 21.5; Ps. 33.20). Since the father's house makes one soul, Achan's family was executed along with him for his sin (Joshua 7.22ff). Similarly God seems to be exclusive of the heavenly host (or the gods) and to hold the power of life and death over them and at the same time to be inclusive of them (Ps. 82.1, 6-7).[3]

There seems also to be at least a third approach to the relationship of the one and the many, which cuts across the two mentioned above. The individual who is a manifestation of the whole may be spoken of precisely as the extension, not of the whole, but of the father or lord whose will or soul creates the whole. The servant who is a member of a household may function as the lord of the house; in fact, the servant virtually is the lord (Gen. 44.4ff); yet the master is a distinct personality.[4] God, who is lord of the heavenly hosts, may be identified with *the* angel of God or Yahweh (Gen. 21.17-19, 22.11-18, 32.24-30; Hos. 12.4-5; Judg. 6.14) and yet is distinguished from the angel (Exod. 14.18-22; Judg. 6.12, 22; 2 Sam. 24.16).[5]

It is evident from the foregoing that the Old Testament does not present a logical statement of what unity in diversity is. As Knight has said, it rather uses dissimilar concepts which are pictorial or parabolic to view the relationship of the one and the many from different angles.[6] In a similar vein, Jones

[1] Johs. Pedersen, *Israel*, London, 1954, I-II, 109-10, 178, 171ff. G. A. F. Knight, *A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Edinburgh, 1953, p. 11.

[2] Knight, op. cit., pp. 14-16, 22.

[3] Knight, op. cit., pp. 22, 21. Pedersen, op. cit., 130, 165, 179.

[4] See Aubrey R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*, Cardiff, 1942, pp. 8-9. See below the discussion of *Shaliach*.

[5] Knight, op. cit., pp. 25-26. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel*, London, 1953, III-IV, 496-97.

[6] Knight, op. cit., pp. 22-3, 26-7.

states that the difficulty which the primitive mind has in distinguishing the self from the group and in conceiving of the ego as a clearly defined entity is an instance of mythological thinking.[1]

To return now to Paul, we probably should not reject altogether the notion that for Paul the Church is Christ's instrument in the world. In view of Best's criticisms it must be admitted that this idea is not as explicit as has been thought, but the very fact that Paul calls the Church Christ's Body means that the idea *is* implicit. We shall see that it becomes more explicit in Matthew.

Being in the Body of Christ is the communal aspect of being 'in Christ', and the idea of Christ as a corporate personality stands behind both. As the Christian is in Christ and in His Body, so Christ is in the Christian (Gal. 2.20) and in the community (Rom. 8.10). The Body, then, is a living entity indwelt by Christ or by the Spirit (Rom. 8.9; 1 Cor. 12.13), and experientially the two were virtually the same for Paul (2 Cor. 3.17; Rom. 8.9).

We turn now to a very brief discussion of the sources of Paul's doctrine, and this will form a bridge to our discussion of Matthew. It would seem that two elements from Paul's religious heritage especially helped him to fashion his concept of the Body of Christ (and the idea of something like corporate personality stands behind both of them.)[2] Schweitzer[3] has pointed out the Jewish eschatological belief that the elect are predestined to union with one another and with the Messiah (Isa. 4.3; Mal. 3.16-17; Ps. 69.29; Dan. 12.1; 1 Enoch 103.2ff, 104.1, 108.3; Ps. Sol. 18.4-6; Dan. 7.27; 1 Enoch 38.1-5, 62.7-8, 14-15). W. D. Davies acknowledges the relevance of this point but holds that it is necessary to bring in also the rabbinic speculations about the unity of mankind in Adam (Sanhedrin 4.5; b. Sanh. 38ª; Gen. R. 8; Sifra 89). Since Paul thinks of Christ's advent as a new creation, he easily thinks of Christ as a new Adam (Rom. 5.12-21; 1 Cor. 15.45-49). As

[1] G. V. Jones, *Christology and Myth in the New Testament*, London, 1956, p. 247.

[2] For bibliographical references to works that take a different point of view on the sources of Paul's thought here see J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 55. C. T. Craig, op. cit., p. 83.

[3] Albert Schweitzer (translated by W. Montgomery), *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, London, 1931, pp. 101-5. See also Dodd, op. cit., p. 62. George Johnston, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1943, p. 88.

Adam's 'body' included all mankind in a natural order, so the Body of Christ would include the new mankind reconstituted as a spiritual community.[1]

A more immediate impulse to Paul's doctrine, however, would have been the fact that Jesus had actually formed the messianic community.[2] Paul knew that those whom he persecuted were the disciples of Jesus, who shortly became the Christ for Paul, so we are led to the most immediate cause of his doctrine. Paul realised that in persecuting the Church he was persecuting Christ (Acts 26.14f, 9.4f, 22.7f). His faith rested on the revelation of the resurrection body of Christ, not just as an individual, but as the Christian community.[3]

If we say that Matthew conceives of the Church as the Body of Christ, we are not saying that Paul influenced Matthew, but that both drew from the same source—the Jewish expectation of an eschatological community and Jesus' fulfilment of that hope. Although Matthew does not explicitly call the Church the Body,[4] it would seem that the doctrine of the Body is implicit in our Gospel (in view of what Paul means by it) if it can be shown that Christ is present in the Church, that He identifies Himself with it, and that the Church carries out the messianic functions.[5] Certain pivotal sections will be con-

[1] W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1948, pp. 41, 45, 53-5, 56-7.

[2] For a defence of the position that this was, in fact, Jesus' intention see R. Newton Flew, *Jesus and his Church*, London, 1951, pp. 36-8, 53-7. Oscar Cullmann (translated by Floyd V. Filson), *Peter, Disciple—Apostle—Martyr*, London, 1953, p. 189. Vincent Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, London, 1954, p. 90. George S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, London, 1948, pp. 209-11, 222. John W. Bowman, *The Intention of Jesus*, Philadelphia, 1943, 210-12. Olof Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche in der Neueren Forschung*, Uppsala, 1932, pp. 166-7, 177. Julius Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, Göttingen, 1954, p. 190.

[3] See Robinson, op. cit., pp. 56-8. One cannot always assume that the words attributed to Paul in Acts reflect Paul's own thought, but the references cited here do seem to be generally consistent with Paul's ideas.

[4] Robinson (op. cit., p. 9) holds that only Paul gives *soma* doctrinal significance while G. D. Kilpatrick (*The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, Oxford, 1950, p. 130) says explicitly—but it would seem wrongly—that the idea of the Church as the Body is not mentioned in Matthew.

[5] Manson has pointed out that the essential thing for the Body of Christ idea is that the Messiah uses the Church, His Body, to continue His own ministry. See T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry*, London, 1948, pp. 20-1. This has also been emphasised by E. Schweizer: 'Alles Handeln der Gemeinde kann nur die Antwort des Glaubens an dieses, *sein* Handeln sein. . . . Wenn die Gemeinde an der Gekreuzigten glaubt, dann weiss sie nicht nur, dass ihr Tun demütiges Dienen sein muss und der Gnade bedarf; sondern dass es letztlich überhaupt nur ein fruchtbares Tun ist, soweit der Herr selber darin wirksam ist.'—E. Schweizer, *Das Leben des Herrn in der Gemeinde und Ihren Diensten*, Zürich, 1946, pp. 21, 31-2.

sidered to show that Matthew conceived of the messianic community as the Body of Christ.

We may begin with Matt. 18.5 which says that whoever receives a little child in Christ's name receives Christ. This is because such a one represents Christ. In 18.6 this 'little one' is seen to be a Christian, for it is a little one who believes in Christ that is involved. Thus, to receive a Christian is to receive Christ. This becomes more explicit in Matt. 10.40 where it is said that anyone who receives one of Christ's disciples receives Christ.

Here we are dealing with the same type of thought as that connected with the Jewish *shaliach*,[1] a derivative of *shalach* (to send), which in the LXX is rendered by *apostellein*, the verb corresponding to *apostolos*. In Jewish thought the *shaliach* could be the messenger or agent of an individual, a corporate body, or God.[2] This institution arose out of the needs of secular life and was later given religious sanction while the Christian apostles were religious in origin. The principle of the *shaliach*, however, is the same as that which meets us in Matt. 10.40. A person's *shaliach* is like himself, and his actions count as those of his principal. The person sent forth incorporates the higher authority of him who sends him (*Ber.* 5.5).[3] To receive Jesus' apostles, then, is to receive Him.

It is probable that the *shaliach* could not transmit his commission to another (*Gittin* 3.6). This fits Matthew's conception of the Church, for in our Gospel one generation does not need to pass the commission on to the next. The risen Lord, continually present in the Church, gives the commission to each generation (Matt. 18.20, 28.19-20). It could well be that the concept of the *shaliach* enforces the closeness between Messiah and community already present in the expectation of an eschatological messianic community, and both ideas go back to the Old Testament conception of corporate personality.

This identification of Christ with His Church is found again in Matt. 25.31-46, for here it is said that to perform charitable acts for the brothers of Christ is to perform them for Christ (25.40). This suggests that there is a close connexion between

[1] For the relevance of this term for discussions on the Christian ministry see Manson, op. cit.; K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry*, New York, 1946.
[2] Manson, op. cit., pp. 35-42.
[3] See Flew, op. cit., p. 79. Manson, op. cit., p. 36

Christ and His brothers and that they represent Him as His Body.[1] Théo Preiss has affirmed that it is not 'as if' one had done it to Jesus; it is rather a real identification.[2]

A number of scholars[3] interpret the brothers of Jesus to refer to all the poor and needy, anyone in need; and that may have been the original intent if the section is a genuine utterance of Jesus. In Matthew, however, *adelphos*, except where it refers to a blood brother, seems to mean a Christian (5.22; 18.15, 21, 5.23f; 5.47, 7.3-5). This would seem to be substantiated by the fact that in Mark 3.34 Jesus' brothers are those sitting around Him while in Matt. 12.49 they are His disciples. It is suggested here that Matt. 25.31-46 must be interpreted in connexion with the mission of the disciples (Church) in Matt. 10. Those who perform charitable acts or neglect to do so in Matt. 25 are those who receive the proclaimers of the Gospel or refuse them in Matt. 10.13-15. The sheep, then, in Matt. 25 are pictured in the moment of their coming into the Church.

T. W. Manson holds that the brothers of Jesus are included in the Son of Man since they are distinct from both the righteous and the wicked. Jesus is the 'king.' The Son of Man, then, is the Danielic kingdom of the saints of which Jesus is the Head, and the parousia is the elevation of this Body to supreme power over all the nations of the world.[4] This fits Manson's thesis that the Son of Man in the Gospels is an embodiment of the remnant idea and is more a corporate than an individual concept. Manson's position may be summarised as follows.[5]

It is Jesus' mission to create the Son of Man through His ministry and by consolidating His followers. Only when they fail to meet the test does He stand alone as Son of Man. Manson questions whether the Son of Man in 1 Enoch is really an *individual* Messiah and emphasises his close relations with his community. It is evident that the Son of Man in 1 Enoch has a community, but it seems from a reading of

[1] T. H. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew*, New York and London, 1927, pp. 208-9.
[2] Théo Preiss (translated by Harold Knight), *Life in Christ*, London, 1954, pp. 50-5.
[3] William Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, London, 1952, p. 119. Joachim Jeremias (translated by S. H. Hooke), *The Parables of Jesus*, London, 1954, pp. 142-4. Preiss, op. cit., p. 52. A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, London, 1952, p. 370.
[4] T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge, 1948, p. 265.
[5] ibid., pp. 227-9.

1 Enoch 38, 39, and 45 that the Son of Man is clearly distinguished from the 'righteous ones' and 'elect ones'. We may agree with Manson that the Son of Man in Daniel *is* a community.

Manson has pointed out further that there is a striking resemblance between the predicted fate of the Son of Man and the demands which Jesus made upon His disciples. They, too must suffer (Mark 8.34-35; Matt. 16.24-25); and with Him they would form the remnant that saves by suffering. Jesus gives no hint that He would not have allowed the disciples to go to death with Him (Mark 14.26-31; Matt. 26.30-35), and He asks James and John if they can share His fate (Mark 10.33-34, 38; Matt. 20.18-19, 22).[1]

Though there is a certain appeal in Manson's thesis, the evidence probably points in another direction. There is really no reason why Jesus could not have been called both 'King' and 'Son of Man' in Matt. 25.31-46,[2] and Jesus probably would not have been guilty of the confusion and ambiguity of using the title in a double sense. Moreover, the community idea is not really natural in the Son of Man sayings.[3] In Matt. 19.28 the disciples are also associated with Jesus in an apocalyptic saying about judgment, and here the twelve are clearly distinguished from the Son of Man. It would seem that Manson's evidence shows that the community shares the fate of the Son of Man but not that it is identical with Him. The parousia, then, is not the elevation of the community to supreme power over all the nations of the world.

The position taken here is that the Son of Man *has* a community, *not* that he *is* a community; and he is present in that community. Matt. 18.20 enunciates the promise that Jesus will be in the midst of two or three who are gathered together in His name. It is in virtue of this presence that the Church is the Body of Christ and that it has the authority to carry out its judicial functions.[4] To the eschatological saying which concludes the Markan account of the institution of the Lord's Supper Matthew adds the words 'with you' (*meth humōn*)

[1] Manson, op. cit., pp. 231-2.
[2] See Duncan, op. cit., pp. 197-8. Preiss, op. cit., pp. 47-8.
[3] Flew, op. cit., p. 54.
[4] Cullmann suggests that this verse has reference to the presence of Christ in the eucharist. See Oscar Cullmann (translated by A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance), *Early Christian Worship*, London, 1953, p. 14.

(26.29). This addition may reflect the presence of Christ which Matthew's Church felt when it celebrated the Eucharist, a presence which anticipated the fellowship which it would experience in the final manifestation of the Kingdom. Matthew begins (1.22-23) by saying that the birth of Jesus means that God is 'with us' (*meth hēmōn ho theos*). It ends (28.20) by promising the continuing presence of the risen Lord with His disciples—'with you' (*meth humᵒn*). The risen Christ gives directions to His disciples and promises to be with them until the end of the age. Resurrection means the continuation of life, so the resurrected Christ takes up His ministry again in the Church, His Body. Christians are not His successors but His companions[1]; and in virtue of His presence in the Church the latter performs the messianic functions. It is in this sense that Christ is identified with the Church: the Church continues His ministry and performs His functions (as we shall see below). There is identity of activity, but it is not that there is a loss of independent existence on the part of either. Christ identifies Himself with His Church, but the Church is not identical with Him, nor is it equal to Him. He continues to be the Lord and Judge of the Church (Matt. 28.18-20, 13.30, 36-43).[2]

In the Son of Man sayings in Matthew, the future coming of the Son of Man in judgment is emphasised, and parallel to this is the association of the Church with the Son of Man in the final judgment (19.28). The Son of Man, however, also had power while on earth to forgive sins (Matt. 9.6). In Matt. 18 we find the Church reflecting this judging function of the Son of Man. Here we find the Church dealing with sin, disciplining its members, and assuming the right of judgment. It is interesting—and probably no accident on Matthew's part—that the presence of Christ (18.20) and Matthew's second mention of the word *ecclesia* (18.17) occur in the same context. If the disciplinary measures are to be carried out in a practicable way, *ecclesia* here must have reference in the first place to a local congregation, though the connotation in 16.18 is certainly the one universal Church.

[1] See T. W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah*, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 89-90, 96, 98. Cullmann also finds the Body of Christ here. See Oscar Cullmann (translated by Floyd V. Filson), *Christ and Time*, London, 1951, pp. 108-9.

[2] This is comparable to Paul's paradox that the Church *is* the Body of Christ; yet Christ is the Head and Saviour of the Body.

Matt. 18 begins (vv. 1-5) by stating that one must become as a little child in order to enter the Kingdom of heaven. The terminology changes at 18.6, however, from 'little child' to 'these little ones that believe on me', so it is probably Christians rather than children literally or the poor whom Matthew has in mind. Woe is pronounced upon these who cause these little ones to stumble (18.6-7), and the occasions of stumbling could be those Christians who have too little regard for the law (see 5.19).

Matt. 18.8-9 turns to offences against oneself. Here as in 5.29-30 Jesus teaches that if some member of the Body causes one to stumble he should cut it off rather than be kept out of the Kingdom by it. In their present context these verses may have meant to Matthew that unworthy 'members' should be cut off from the Church conceived as the Body.[1] This interpretation is suggested by the fact that 18.8-9 is surrounded by sayings about one *person* causing another *person* to stumble (18.6-7, 10). It is enforced by the fact that 18.15-17 actually makes provision for the removal of sinners.

The parable of the Lost Sheep (18.12-14) follows the injunction not to cause one of the little ones to stumble. If God is so concerned over one lost sheep, it is certainly a serious thing to cause one to go astray. This parable in Luke (15.3-7) teaches God's joy over one sinner that repents, but in Matthew the meaning is somewhat narrower. In its context it seems to teach that the Church should go after an erring brother, that is, a Christian brother. God does not want to lose one of His own.

In 18.15-17 the Church appears as an organised society with prescribed methods of discipline. A brother who sins is to be sought by one person. If he refuses to take heed, the one who is seeking him should take two or three others; and if this fails, he should be taken before the Church. If he refuses to hear the Church, he is to be considered as the gentile and publican—excommunicated. This three-step disciplinary scheme is reflected in the Qumran Manual of Discipline (5.25–6.1),[2] which may indicate that Matthew's Church knew something

[1] See McNeile, op. cit., p. 262. Benjamin W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, New York, 1930, pp. 410-11.

[2] For further references to the Qumran judicial procedure see the *Manual of Discipline*, 6.24-25, 7.1-2, 6.27; *Zadokite Fragment*, 14.5-6.

of the practices of the Qumran Sect. We should not necessarily link Matthew too closely with the Qumran milieu, however, for Paul knew a somewhat similar procedure for Church discipline (Gal. 6.1, 2; 1 Cor. 9.19-22; 1 Cor. 5.1-13).[1] Matt. 18.15-17 is undoubtedly a piece of primitive Church legislation thrown back into the mouth of Jesus,[2] though some will see in it a genuine saying.[3]

Who is the sinner who is to be so treated here? Many interpreters[4] have assumed that it is the lost sheep, the one led astray or caused to stumble, that is in mind here; but it would seem more probable that it is the one who caused the stumbling who is primarily in view. Matt. 18.17 states that the sinner can be put out, and in 18.8-9 it is the offending member which is cut off; moreover, in 13.41 it is those who *cause* stumbling and do iniquity who are removed from the Kingdom of the Son of Man. In actual practice probably both groups were included.

Our passage is probably based on the wider principle, 'If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him' (Luke 17.3). In the brotherhood of the Church one brother is responsible for another. It is not just that a man is responsible to try to lead to repentance one who sins against him personally, but he should try to win any sinner in the Church. The Byzantine manuscripts, D, θ, the Vulgate and some Old Latin, and the Syriac record, 'And if thy brother sin against thee' (*eis se*); but B and ℵ omit *eis se*.[5] The latter is the preferred reading, which means that a Christian must seek any sinner, not just one who sins against him. Each individual has the power to convict of sin and to set right, but he does not have the right to retain sins. He must take two or three witnesses, for the power of binding is greater than that of loosing.[6]

The two or three witnesses have reference to Deut. 19.15;

[1] See W. D. Davies, 'Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11.25-30', *Harvard Theological Review*, XLVI (1953), 114. C. H. Dodd, 'Matthew and Paul', *The Expository Times*, LVIII (Oct. 1946-Sept. 1947), 294-5.

[2] Bacon, op. cit., p. 406. Davies, 'Knowledge', p. 114. T. H. Robinson, *Matt.*, p. 154.

[3] A. Schlatter, *Die Kirche des Matthäus*, Gütersloh, 1929, p. 27. M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, Paris, 1948, p. 355.

[4] McNeile, op. cit., p. 266. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 353. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 28-9. Alfred Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, London, 1911, pp. 252-3.

[5] According to D. Eberhard and D. Erwin Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1952.

[6] See Schniewind, op. cit., p. 200.

17.6, but here in Matthew they do not function as witnesses before a tribunal necessary for conviction as in Deuteronomy. The purpose of the witnesses may be to give evidence that they have tried to convince the sinner, but it seems probable that their purpose is a united effort at leading him to repentance.

If the sinner will not hear this little group, he is taken to the assembly; and if he will not hear the assembly he is to be condemned and treated as an outcast and enemy of God.

In Matt. 18.18 the power of binding and loosing, which in 16.19 was promised to Peter, is now promised to all the disciples, and their judgment like his is to be valid with God. The power to bind (*'asar*) and to loose (*sh'ra'*) in first century Judaism could have a legislative or judicial reference.[1] Legislatively, it could mean to forbid or to allow an act; judicially, it could mean to apply or lift the ban. Certainly the judicial function is in prominence in Matt. 18.18, and this aspect of the power allows an explanation in terms of preaching. Removing the ban and excommunicating are associated with forgiving and withholding the forgiveness of sins; and it is the proclaimed word, and the acceptance or rejection of the word by those who hear, that determines whether or not they are forgiven (Matt. 10.13f, Mark 4.11ff).[2] If Jesus made any reference to binding and loosing, this is probably what He meant by it; but for Matthew it has become the institutional ecclesiastical power to excommunicate. Dodd holds that the action is to be carried out under apostolic authority[3]; but since the word *ecclesia* is mentioned in 18.17, it would seem that the *humeis* implied in *dēsēte* and *lusēte* has reference to the disciples considered as the Church.

In 18.19-20 we find the basis of the authority which has just been claimed. If these words are genuine, as Lagrange asserts,[4] their meaning would, nevertheless, have been deepened for Matthew in view of the Church's experience of the risen Christ. The Church's power is not based on its own independent standing but on its relation to God, this relationship being sustained by prayer.[5] Bacon has claimed that the Church's

[1] See Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, München, 1922, I, 738-9.
[2] See Schniewind, op. cit., p. 191.
[3] Dodd, 'Matt. and Paul', p. 295. [4] op. cit. p. 356.
[5] Schniewind, op. cit., p. 201. Wilhelm Vischer, *Die Evangelische Gemeindeordnung*, Zollikon—Zürich, 1946, pp. 71-2.

belief is nothing new but is only an adoption of the Synagogue belief that its prayers avail with God and that its decisions have divine sanction.[1] There is something more here, however. The power of prayer is the presence of Christ in the Church. He is living and acting among His own, so their prayers are inspired by His Spirit. The Church is not so much uttering its own words as the words of Jesus, and this presence of Christ gives the right of judgment. This is comparable to Paul's belief (Rom. 8.26-27) that the Spirit makes intercession for us and makes our prayers known to God.

It is no longer the words of *Torah* which are the bond of connexion but rather the name of Christ. It is no longer the *shekinah* which is present in the fellowship furnishing its vital power but the presence of Christ Himself (compare Pirqê Aboth 3.3).

Here we must refer back to 18.17, which allows excommunication, and note that 13.28-30, 39-42 reserves the separation of the wicked from the Church for the judgment of the Son of Man at the *eschaton*.[2] How, then, can the Church excommunicate? Perhaps it can be partly explained as the proleptic exercise of its eschatological authority (19.28). In the second place we should notice that the theme of unlimited forgiveness (18.21-22) follows the section on discipline. In Jesus' original words this teaching on forgiveness undoubtedly was meant to apply to personal relations between man and man; but when Matthew puts it in this context, it can hardly be doubted that he means to extend its application to the relationship between the Church and its members. Especially is this suggested by the fact that it is Peter, the Rock, who raises the question. The Church, then, is to assume a forgiving attitude toward its straying members.

Does this mean that the Church does not really excommunicate? If 18.15-17 is not a genuine saying of Jesus, which it

[1] Bacon, op. cit., p. 406.

[2] The interpretation of the parable of the Tares (Matt. 13.36-43) is taken as a product of Matthew or his source, not as an utterance of Jesus. It seems that Matthew identifies the Church with the Kingdom of the Son of Man (13.41) but not with the Kingdom of Heaven. The Church has sinners (18.15-17), and the Kingdom of the Son of Man has stumbling-blocks (13.41), but the Kingdom of Heaven has only the righteous (13.43; 25.34, 46). The Kingdom of Heaven in Matthew is future as well as present and has an eternal reference (25.46) while the Church (28.20) and the Kingdom of the Son of Man (13.41) will end with the parousia.

probably is not, it would never have come into existence had the disciplinary measures outlined therein not been actually carried out. The Church is to forgive and forgive, but as a last resort it should excommunicate. The two attitudes toward the separation of the wicked presented in Matt. 18 and Matt. 13 are not as opposed as they seem at first sight when the two reconciling factors of prolepsis and forgiveness are considered, but even then it seems that there is a certain disparity between them.

Following 18.21-22 is the parable of the Unforgiving Servant which enforces the previous teaching on forgiveness. Although the parable does not precisely teach repeated forgiveness, as 18.21-22 does, it is certainly not opposed to that teaching. God, the greatest creditor in the universe, has forgiven freely. When His children do not forgive, they are punished because they show that they have not really accepted forgiveness. To accept forgiveness is to manifest the forgiving spirit. The brother who is to be forgiven (18.35) is no doubt a fellow-Christian since this verse comes at the end of the Church's code of discipline. Again, Matthew probably means this parable to apply to the Church's attitude as well as to the individual's.

We move now to a briefer consideration of Matt. 10, which records the account of the apostolic mission. Here we have not merely a proselytising and winning of adherents but an extension of the Messiah's ministry.[1] Schweitzer[2] holds that Matt. 10 is practically a word-for-word discourse delivered by Jesus to the disciples before sending them out, but it is probably to be taken as a collection of sayings.[3] This does not mean that most of them are not genuine. Nor do we have any reason to doubt the historicity of the mission, for it is reflected in all four sources: Mark (6.8-11); Q (Luke 10.2f, 8-12, 13-16); M (Matt. 10.5-8, 9-13, 16b, 23-25, 40-42); L (Luke 10.1, 17-20 [the seventy]).[4] Mark and Luke give two separate incidents, the call of the twelve (Mark 3.13-19; Luke 6.13-16) and their mission (Mark 6.7ff; Luke 9.1ff). Matthew omits the first

[1] See T. W. Manson, *Ministry*, pp. 24-6. T. W. Manson, *Servant*, pp. 59-60.
[2] Albert Schweitzer (translated by W. Montgomery), *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, New York, 1950, pp. 362-3.
[3] B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, London, 1930, pp. 34-5.
[4] Vincent Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, London, 1954, p. 106.

incident and simply assumes the existence of the twelve (10.1) before he relates the account of their mission.

We may begin by pointing out that salvation is determined by whether or not a person confesses Christ (10.32-33) and follows Him (10.38). With those who do so link their lives with Him He identifies Himself (10.40) as we saw above, for they carry out important messianic functions. They are the body of the Messiah on earth, carrying out His ministry. The Church is to preach (10.7) as Jesus did (4.17, 9.35, 11.5), and it preaches the same message—the good news that the Kingdom of Heaven has drawn near (compare 4.17 and 10.7). The Church also carries on the messianic ministry of healing and casting out demons (10.8), an activity of Jesus which is prominent in Matthew (8.5-13, 14-17, 28-34; 9.1-7, 18-31, 32-34, 35; 11.5). Moreover, the ministry of Jesus was of ultimate significance for the world, and so is the ministry of the Church of decisive significance. To reject the mission and message of the Church (10.13-15) leads to the same result as to reject the mission and message of Jesus (11.19-24). That is to say, it leads to condemnation in the final judgment. But it must not be thought that Matthew presents the Church as identical with or equal to Christ. The ministry of the Church is derivative, and the Church has its existence and message only because the Kingdom of God has in some sense come (or begun to dawn) in the ministry of Jesus (Matt. 12.28; 11.2-6, 11-13, 13.16-17; 12.41-42).

The climax of Jesus' ministry was His death on the cross, so it is not surprising that the Church suffers in virtue of carrying out the messianic ministry. In Matt. 10 it is the very mission of the Church in which it fulfils the messianic functions of preaching and healing which leads to its suffering. The disciples can expect no better than their Master (10.24-25). They will be persecuted, scourged, and hated (10.17-22; 5.11-12) and must be prepared for conflict in their own families (10.35-36); in fact, those in the Church must be prepared to take their crosses and to lose their lives to find them as Christ did (10.38-39; 20.18-22; 16.24). We noted in our discussion of Paul that in his thinking Christ is present in His Body through the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not prominent in Matthew or in the Synoptics as a whole, but here in the face of persecutions which come

from fulfilling the messianic ministry the Church is promised the presence of the Spirit (10.20).

In all of this, however, Matthew does not suggest that the suffering of the Church is an act of atonement. It is a part of fellowship with Christ, but it is not expiatory. Jesus' life, death, and resurrection is the unique event. Christ is the Saviour of the Church (Matt. 20.28, 26.28), and the salvation which the Church proclaims is the forgiveness and New Covenant which the cross of Christ has brought (1.21, 26.28).

What, in conclusion, is the Body of Christ in Matthew? It is the Church, the messianic community, with which Christ identifies Himself, in which He is present, and which carries on His ministry in virtue of that presence. It judges and disciplines itself; it preaches the Gospel of the Kingdom and heals; and as a result of being true to its calling, it suffers.

Matthew tells us that we should have the courage to be the Body of Christ. This means that we must be daring enough to believe that our mission as the continuation of Christ's ministry has a decisive significance for the world. Matthew reminds us that this is true because Christ is among us and that the Church of our day must pray for grace to be willing to find greatness in the way that our Lord found it.

EARLY EXEGESIS OF THE PARABLES

by The Rev. M. F. WILES

The last fifty years have seen revolutionary progress in the work of the interpretation of the parables of Jesus. This progress has been made possible primarily by the final discarding of the allegorical method and the repudiation of 'the centuries of distortion and ill-usage that the parables have suffered through allegorical interpretation'.[1] Exegesis of the parables in centuries before the present might seem therefore to be of purely antiquarian interest. Nevertheless it seems worth while attempting to discover whether there may not be some light to be gained from the way in which the parables were understood by those who stood nearest to them in point of history. This study is therefore devoted to the interpretation of parables in the ante-Nicene fathers.

The way in which anybody interprets the parables will largely be controlled by the answer which he gives to two prior questions—namely: What constitutes a parable? and Why did Jesus use the parabolic method? There is not much direct discussion of these issues. Origen defines a parable as 'an account of an event which did not literally take place, but which could have done so. It is a figurative representation of certain things by virtue of their correspondence to the things spoken of in the parable.' He distinguishes it from a fable (*αἴνιγμα*) where the event spoken of is something which could not conceivably have happened in real life.[2] Elsewhere he distinguishes a parable from a similitude, and describes a parable as a specific form of the wider genus similitude. He does not, however, make clear wherein the point of differentiation lies, nor does he consistently employ this distinction in his own discussions. The point of difference to which he primarily draws attention is that parables are directed to the crowds, to those outside, whereas similitudes are also used in the teaching of the disciples and of those to whom it is given to

[1] J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (Eng. trans. 1954), p. 16.
[2] Origen, *in Prov.* 1.1, 2 (P.G. XIII 20c).

know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.[1] Mark 4.10-12, is clearly at the forefront of his mind in both these passages, and it was inevitable that the explanation of the parabolic teaching given in the Gospels themselves should dominate any consideration of the purpose of the parables. The conclusions drawn from the passage, however, are not uniform. Tertullian argues that the teaching of the passage is that the parables were directed to the Jews, and that therefore the difficulties arising from their allusiveness were not intended to be for all people or for all time. In fact, he says, they do not exist for the Christian, because in the Gospels all the parables are either interpreted by Jesus Himself or explained by the evangelist's introduction or are obvious in meaning.[2] Origen, on the other hand, is less optimistic in his conclusions. He deduces from the passage that the parables are a special case of what is true of Scripture as a whole—namely that the truths of God are given obscurely so that they will be understood and appreciated only by those who are ready and able to benefit by them.[3]

In addition to these general discussions of the purpose of the parables, certain canons of interpretation are laid down from time to time in the course of considering particular parables. Five such canons are worthy of note. Many of them are wise and sound, but too often they are forgotten or ignored except when they happen to serve the interest of the expositor's particular view-point.

(1) The first canon in particular is one to which by and large only lip service is paid. It is the principle that the likenesses in parables are not intended to be complete in every detail. Origen illustrates this point by the example of a picture which can resemble its original in colour but not in shape, while a statue can represent the original shape but not colour; Tertullian insists that some of the details in a parable are there only for the sake of the story and must not be forced into giving some meaning in the exposition.[4] The reason for the firm assertion of this principle is not far to seek. Both writers are

[1] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 10.4.
[2] Tertullian, *De Res. Carn.*, 33.
[3] Origen, *De Princ.*, 3.1.16 (cf. also Clement, *Strom.*, 6.15).
[4] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 10.11; Tertullian, *De Pud.*, 9. It is interesting to note that this fundamental principle is frequently reiterated by later patristic writers, e.g. Rufinus, *Comm. in Symb. Ap.*, 7; Chrysostom, *Matt. Hom.*, 64 (P.G. LVIII 613); Cyril Alex., *Comm. in Luc.*, 16.1-9 (P.G. LXXII 809 CD).

concerned to disallow established Gnostic interpretations of the parables. Many of the parables with their clear contrast between the good and the bad lent themselves easily to an interpretation in terms of the Gnostic doctrine of fixed natures, created either good or bad. This Origen, with his great emphasis on the doctrine of freewill, is determined to rebut, and so he seeks to rule out any such interpretation of the parable of the drag-net by laying down the general principle that not every point of comparison in a parable is to be pressed. Yet he himself goes on immediately to suggest that the Kingdom of Heaven is like the texture of a net, because it is woven out of the varied ideas contained in the Old and New Testaments—a point of comparison which is obviously far less organic to the parable as a whole than that used by the Gnostic interpreters.[1] Tertullian is particularly concerned to disallow Gnostic allegorising of the numbers employed in parables. He wisely asserts that the numbers are normally only incidental to the parables and should not be interpreted allegorically; but in this, as we shall see, he was not followed by the bulk of orthodox interpreters. The first principle then arises out of a desire to counteract false Gnostic interpretations of the parables, but does not in practice exercise much positive influence on orthodox exegesis.

(2) This was not, however, the primary method used for countering Gnostic interpretations. A second canon of orthodox interpretation is the assertion that parables are not to be used as a source for the determination of doctrine, but rather that established doctrine is to be used as a guide for their right interpretation.[2] The Gnostics regularly took advantage of the more ambiguous passages of Scripture, and therefore particularly of the parables as a basis for the exposition of their beliefs and particularly for their belief in the existence of a second God. In fact, a very high proportion of the discussions of individual parables, in the writings of Irenaeus and Tertullian is devoted to showing that they imply the activity of one rather than two gods.[3] But the root answer to the Gnostic case lay in showing the whole process to be invalid. The obscure

[1] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 10.12.
[2] Tertullian, *De Pud.*, 8, 9.
[3] Cf. especially Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 4.36 and 40; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 4.30-36.

must be interpreted on the basis of what is clearly revealed, and not made the starting-point for still great obscurities. The interpretation of parables does admit of doubt, and therefore every interpretation must be carefully seen to be in harmony with the rest of Scripture.[1] This principle, also, is wise counsel; it is a valuable corrective against the multiplication of speculative fancies on the basis of parabolic teaching. But it can easily be abused. If conformity to sound doctrine becomes the all-important criterion for the exegesis of parables, then an artificial allegorism is bound to develop before very long.

(3) A third canon is the need to take note of the historical context of the parables in the Gospels themselves. This principle is obviously sound, even though the historical context, being sometimes the construction of the evangelist, may on occasion lead rather to the meaning of the parable for the evangelist than necessarily to the truly original meaning. In practice, it normally amounted to a consideration as to whether a particular parable was spoken to the crowd or to the disciples. Those spoken to the disciples could with the more certainty and directness be applied to the Christian community and its leaders. Thus the parable of the Servant put in authority is given by St. Luke as an answer to Peter's question, 'Lord are you telling this parable for us or for all?' (Luke 12.41) and this enables Origen to apply the parable directly and without hesitation to the bishops of his own day.[2]

The most striking examples of its use, however, are to be found in the writings of Tertullian. On one occasion he insists that as the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Prodigal Son were concerned with Christ's acceptance of heathen publicans and sinners, they cannot be applied to the restoration of lapsed Christians.[3] The argument is hardly very satisfactory, in that it involves the improbable assertion that the publicans and sinners were heathen rather than Jews, and it ignores the Matthaean setting of the parable of the Lost Sheep which clearly implies the exact reverse of what Tertullian is determined to prove. None the less it is a forceful illustration of the application of the general principle. Elsewhere he makes

[1] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 2.10.1.

[2] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 61.

[3] Tertullian, *De Pud.*, 8, 9. Yet in his pre-Montanist days he had himself used them for this very purpose (*De Poenitentia*, 8). Cf. also Cyprian, *Ep.*, 55.2; ps. Cyprian, *Ad. Novatianum*, 15; Dionysius Alex., *Frag.* (ed. Feltoe, 1904), p. 63.

the interesting suggestion that the parable of Dives and Lazarus was designed to depict the reward of John the Baptist and the torments of Herod and was intended as a warning to the latter.[1] In the bold task of attempting an explanation of the parable of the Unjust Steward, he again suggests a definite setting in the historical ministry of Jesus. He suggests that it refers to the Jewish people's mismanagement of the business of the Lord, and is intended to rebuke them for their failure to make friends rather than enemies of the Gentiles thereby freeing them from their debt of sin to God.[2] Neither of these suggestions is very likely to be right, but they show an interesting concern about the original historical occasion of the parables.

(4) The canon is continually enunciated by Origen that we ought not to be satisfied with the surface meaning of the parables, but should expect to find some deeper meaning in them. We ought not to think of the judgment of the sheep and the goats as simply an exhortation to humanitarianism;[3] we ought not to be content only with the obvious lesson of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant that those who have been forgiven should also be ready to forgive those who wrong them.[4] Clement of Alexandria draws the same distinction. Thus while in his homily on the rich man's salvation, he is only concerned with the first and obvious meaning of the 'parable' of the camel passing through the needle's eye, he reminds his listeners that it has also a higher meaning as a mystery of the Saviour.[5] This principle has much in common with modern insistences that the parables are not just 'forcible illustrations of eminently sound moral and religious principles'.[6] It is not simply the explicit assertion of the need to allegorise, though it is not difficult to see how easily it could amount to that.

(5) Finally may be added Origen's insistence that a true understanding of the parables cannot be attained except by the help of Christ and the gift of the Spirit of God.[7] Moreover no one has progressed so far along the road of sanctity as to be fully conversant with the mind of Christ.[8] This principle is of value in so far as it teaches the need to understand the parables

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 4.34.
[2] Tertullian, *De Fuga*, 13.
[3] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 70.
[4] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.6.
[5] Clement, *Quis Dives*, 26, 27.
[6] C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom* (1935), p. 25.
[7] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.6.
[8] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.11.

from within the experience of Christian obedience and to recognise the possibility of error and incompleteness in even our most certain interpretations. It had, however, one serious danger as applied by Origen. The spirit of humility that it taught appeared to him to justify the setting down of any number of diverse interpretations of the parables, however far-fetched, for who could be sure which was most true to the Spirit of God?

So far we have been concerned to see what principles were enunciated by the earliest Christian writers on the question of how the parables ought to be interpreted. It has already been made clear that they did not always obey their own maxims. We have now, therefore, to ask what in practice are the main tendencies revealed by their actual exegesis of the parables in the course of their work of applying the teaching of Jesus to the life of the Church in their own day. Five such tendencies need to be considered.

(1) The first is the fatal tendency towards allegorical interpretation. Examples of such interpretation are familiar enough, and are inclined to be entertaining rather than edifying. More important is to try and see the particular pressures which led specifically to this allegorical interpretation of the parables.

(*a*) In the first place there was the example of the evangelists themselves. When Origen insists that we ought to look for a deeper meaning in the parables, he does so on the ground that 'we ought to try and find out the significance of each item in the parable on the analogy of the parables interpreted by the evangelists themselves'.[1] As Matthew has given a mystic interpretation of the parables of the Sower and of the Tares, so there must be a similar hidden meaning to all the parables.[2] The Gospel writers, it is true, have only given us such interpretations in a limited number of cases. Yet Jesus must have given more to the disciples, and their omission is no doubt deliberate. It may be due to one of three causes—the interpretations may not be the sort of thing to be included in a public document, or it may be due to lack of room, or it may be to leave freedom to the Spirit to reveal them to the pure in heart.[3] But whatever the reason, the evangelists had given examples of

[1] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.6. [2] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 15.30.
[3] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.12.

allegorical interpretation and the exegete must follow in their train.

It might indeed have been expected that the explanations given in the Gospels would have exerted an absolutely compelling influence on the interpretations at least of those particular parables. But this is not in fact the case, at least with the earliest strand of writing. Thus I Clement has an allusion to the parable of the Sower as a picture of the resurrection.[1] Justin Martyr and the author of the Clementine Recognitions see in the parable an encouragement to the Christian preacher not to despair in his work.[2] This may well be a correct understanding of the parable, as many modern exegetes suggest, but it is not the point brought out by the interpretation given in the Gospels. It is true that in the vast majority of cases the parable is used, as the Gospel suggests, as a warning against the dangers of worldliness and tribulation, but the existence of exceptions is a reminder that it is possible to exaggerate the immediate influence of the Gospel interpretations on the exegesis of the parables.

(*b*) A second cause was a tradition of the elders. That is to say the practice of allegorical interpretations beyond those given in scripture itself goes back before the time of our earliest literary exegetes. Irenaeus attributes to 'the elders, the disciples of the apostles', an interpretation of the hundredfold, sixtyfold, and thirtyfold crops of the seed fallen on the good ground in terms of those who will reach the heavens, paradise, and the city respectively.[3] Origen attributes to 'one of the elders' a thoroughgoing allegorical interpretation of the Good

[1] I Clement 24. This, it is true, can hardly be spoken of as exegesis of the parable. There are traces, particularly at this earliest stage, of the parables exerting a more indirect influence as a vivid part of the creative imagery of Christian thought and writing. Thus Hermas does not expound any of the Gospel parables directly, but draws on a number of them for the imagery of his own (cf. Sim. 5.2, 5.5, 9.20). Clement of Alexandria's use of the parable of the Ten Virgins in *Strom.*, 5.3 may perhaps be classed under this heading, although it is tending towards more conscious allegorical interpretation. 'So it is with the lamps of the wise virgins, lighted at night in the great darkness of ignorance which the Scriptures signify by night. Wise souls, pure as virgins, understanding themselves to be situated in the midst of the ignorance of the world, kindle the light, and rouse the mind, and illumine the darkness, and dispel ignorance, and seek truth, and await the appearance of the Teacher.'

[2] Justin, *Dialogue* 125: *Clementine Recognitions*, 3.14.

[3] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 5.36.2. There was also an early allegorical interpretation of the three yields in terms of three aeons current in Gnostic teaching (Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 8.2).

Samaritan; it is true that he does not accept it as unquestionable gospel, but he gives its main outline strong approval and makes only minor qualifications of his own.[1] We have still further evidence of the early and widespread character of these particular allegorisations. The interpretation of the three yields attributed by Irenaeus to the elders appears also to be known to Clement of Alexandria.[2] That of the Good Samaritan given by Origen is also known to Irenaeus.[3] In both cases, the interpretations, though not explicitly attributed to any earlier authority, appear to be assumed rather than argued, and may therefore be taken with some degree of probability to be already established interpretations of the parables concerned. The fact that the interpretation of the fatted calf in the parable of the Prodigal Son as meaning Christ is given alike by Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen suggests the possibility that that interpretation too derives from an early oral tradition.[4] Such oral traditions going back very nearly to the times of the Apostles themselves must have had considerable influence.

(*c*) A third cause was the influence of Gnostic interpretations. We have already seen that one reaction to Gnostic allegorising was a healthy insistence on the falsity of pressing every detail of a parable in its interpretation. But the main reaction was to produce better orthodox allegorisations. Tertullian does so by way of irony, when in reply to Marcionite interpretations of the parable of the Leaven, he suggests that leaven is a suitable image for the Kingdom of the Creator, because of its association with the oven or furnace of Hell.[5] But Origen adopts the Gnostic method with complete seriousness. Thus just as the three measures of leaven were interpreted by the Naassenes of the threefold origin of life,[6] and by the Valentinians of the three different natures of man,[7] they are interpreted with equal arbitrariness by Origen either of the three sons of Noah (signifying the whole human race),[8] or of the body, soul and spirit or of the Trinity.[9] Again, where the Valentinians inter-

[1] Origen, *Hom. Luc.*, 34.
[2] Clement, *Strom.*, 6.14.
[3] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 3.17.3. (Cf. also Clement, *Quis Dives*, 28, 29, who gives both a straightforward interpretation of the parable and one applying it to Christ.)
[4] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 3.11.8: Tertullian, *De Pud.*, 9: Origen, *Hom. Gen.*, 4.2, 17.3, *Hom. Lev.*, 1.2.
[5] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 4.30.
[6] Hippolytus, *Ref.*, 5.3.
[7] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 1.8.3.
[8] Origen, *Frag.* (in Possinus' Catena on Matt. 13.33).
[9] Origen, *Schol. in Luc.*, 13.21 (P.G. XVII 357 CD).

preted the parable of the Ten Virgins in terms of the five bodily senses contrasted with the intellectual faculties,[1] Origen similarly interprets the parable of the five senses in man.[2]

(*d*) Finally allegorical interpretations seemed more satisfying and more complete, and were therefore felt to fulfil the justifiable urge to find a deeper meaning in the parables. When Origen moves on from his initial to his deeper interpretation of a parable, he describes the first as 'rather too general and not word for word'.[3] He then sets about immediately identifying each individual term in the parable, although thereby going against one of the very canons of interpretation which he himself lays down. This becomes so definitely the established pattern of interpretation, that he is seriously puzzled by the occurrence of one less character in the Matthaean version of the parable about going before the Judge as compared with the Lucan version.[4]

(2) The second main tendency in exegesis is a tendency to generalise the significance of the parables. Something of this kind is inevitable, if parables originally directed to a particular historical situation are to be applied to the varied circumstances of ordinary life. Thus the parable of the mustard seed is normally interpreted by the earliest expositors of the historical growth of the Church from small and insignificant beginnings,[5] but soon comes to be treated as an entirely general image of any word of Scripture[6] or of the power of faith.[7] In his discussion of the parable of the Two Sons, Origen recognises that its immediate historical reference was a contrast between the publicans and harlots on the one hand and the leaders of the Jews on the other; but he is mainly interested in the parable for the general contrast that it draws between profession and practice, which can be applied to the profession of virginity or any other aspect of Christian living.[8] Similarly with the parable of the Budding Fig Tree, he does give an interpretation in terms of Christ's coming to the Jews, but this interpretation takes

[1] Tertullian, *De Anima*, 18.
[2] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 63.
[3] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 17.6: ὁλοσχερεστέρα τις καὶ οὐ κατὰ λέξιν. (Cf. ibid., 14.6.)
[4] Origen, *Hom. Luc.*, 35.
[5] Irenaeus, *Frag.*, 31 (P.G. VII 1245A): Clement Alex., *Frag.*, 7 (P.G. IX 743A).
[6] Origen, *Hom. Ex.*, 1.1.
[7] Methodius, *De Lepra*, 2.3 (Berlin Corpus edn., N. Bonwetsch, 1917, p. 452).
[8] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 17.4, 5.

second place both in order and in emphasis to a general interpretation in terms of the Christian individual.[1]

(3) A third tendency is the habit of grouping parables together and seeking to interpret them in the light of one another. Thus in his discussion of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, Origen raises the question as to whether the mention of a vineyard has the same significance in all the parables or whether it is patient of a different interpretation in each.[2] Again his discussion of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant is in fact a joint discussion of all the parables involving a reckoning with servants—i.e. the parable of the Two Debtors, the parable of the Unjust Steward, and both versions of the parable of the Talents. As a result, the question as to why the servants in the Matthaean version of the parable of the Talents are entrusted with different amounts is treated with considerable caution, as there is also the Lucan version where they are all given the same. Also the parable of the Unmerciful Servant is taken to refer to the final judgment on the analogy of the accepted significance of the reckoning in the parable of the Talents.[3] Such a method is not without value, if used with due caution in this general kind of way for the overall comparison of kindred parables. But as the examples already given show, it is open to serious danger. It can easily lead to an obscuring of the essential individuality of each parable, and to false interpretations through the comparison of parables which have only incidental features in common. Thus Irenaeus uses the text 'the field is the world' from the Matthaean explanation of the parable of the Tares as direct proof of the significance of the field in the parable of the Hidden Treasure.[4] Origen, as is to be expected, is particularly prone to this. For example, the building of the tower in the vineyard let out to wicked husbandmen suggests the story of the man who built a tower and was not able to finish,[5] and the excuse of the man who had bought a field in the parable of the Great Supper suggests the story of the man who found treasure and bought the field in which it was hidden.[6] How deeply ingrained the principle is with him is shown by the fact that he employs it even when it

[1] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 53.
[2] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 15.30.
[3] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.6-13.
[4] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 4.26.1.
[5] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 17.7.
[6] Origen, *Luc. Frag.* (P.G. XIII 1905A).

raises problems for exegesis rather than solves them. Thus he compares the three servants in the Matthaean parable of the Talents with the three yields of the seed on the good ground, although the comparison immediately poses the problem that in one case the third is saved while in the other he is condemned.[1]

(4) There is also a strong tendency to think of the Kingdom of God as likened to the main item in the parable rather than to the situation as a whole. This was very likely to arise because it is easier to handle the specific concept of a particular thing rather than the more elusive concept of a relationship or whole situation. It was made the more likely by the introductory formula to so many of the parables, 'The kingdom of heaven is like . . . '. The Greek form of wording suggests a comparison with the object instead of with the whole situation in a way in which the underlying Aramaic would not have done.[2] The issue is raised by Origen in his discussion of the parable of the Hidden Treasure, where he asks the question whether the kingdom of heaven is being likened to the treasure only, so that the field refers to something other than the kingdom or whether it is being likened to the whole concept of the treasure hidden in the field, so that the kingdom of heaven corresponds both to the field and to the treasure hidden in it. He does not directly answer his own question, though his subsequent discussion suggests that he did not regard it as affecting seriously the exegesis of the parable.[3] In that he is probably right. But the very manner in which the question is raised shows how deeply ingrained was the idea that the point of comparison was with the main item or items of the parable. The same tendency underlies an interesting line of argument used by Origen in his commentary on the Song of Songs. He argues that if a grain of mustard seed, the smallest of all seeds, actually corresponds to the kingdom of heaven itself, then surely all seeds, all plants and all living things must have their heavenly counterparts. In other words, he finds in what he believed to be the comparison of the kingdom of heaven to a simple physical object evidence of the sacramental character of the whole world in which we live.[4] The axiomatic nature of

[1] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 66.
[2] Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 77-80.
[3] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 10.6.
[4] Origen, *in Can. Can.*, 3 (P.G. XIII 173A-174C).

this tendency in interpretation is further illustrated by the fact that it was maintained, even though it raised serious difficulties for the expositor. When the subject-matter of the parable is the activity of a king, the expositor may rejoice in this evidence of the kingship of Christ[1]; but often the subject of the parable is only a man or a house-holder, and the fact of such straightforward human figures being used as pictures of God was obviously an embarrassment and was felt to demand justification.[2] If the use of human analogies was felt to be a difficulty, the comparison of the kingdom of heaven to mustard seed or leaven was felt to be even more unworthy. Porphyry used it as a means of pouring scorn and ridicule on the Christian Church.[3] Tertullian is conscious that leaven has normally a bad sense in the Bible,[4] and 'Adamantius' has to argue that mustard seed and leaven must be good because the Kingdom of God is compared to them.[5] Clement finds the goodness of mustard in that, in contrast to honey, it lessens bile (i.e. anger) and stops inflammation (i.e. pride).[6] But the supreme example of the problem is the difficulty felt about parables whose principal figure is an immoral or undesirable character. Thus the parable describing the return of Christ as like the coming of a thief was felt to involve the comparison of Jesus to a thief, which was inconceivable. The parable was therefore completely misinterpreted of the need to guard against the coming of the devil.[7] Similarly in the parable of the Importunate Widow, it was felt impossible to regard the unjust judge as representing God; he was therefore interpreted as the Antichrist, and the parable once again completely misunderstood.[8] A further result of this way of thinking about the parables is to regard them as teaching direct lessons about the subject-matter of the story of the parable, so that Epiphanius can regard the parable

[1] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 14.7. [2] Origen, *Matt. Tom.*, 17.18.
[3] Harnack, *Die Kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der Exegetischen Arbeit des Origenes* (1919), p. 21.
[4] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 4.30.
[5] Adamantii Dialogus, *De Recta in Deum Fide*, 2.20 (Berlin Corpus edn., W. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, 1901, p. 110).
[6] Clement, *Paid.* 1.11.
[7] Origen, *Matt. Comm. Ser.*, 59. It is probable that this difficulty was felt in New Testament times. For although 1 Thess. 5.2 does speak of the Lord coming like a thief in the night, His coming is only like a thief to those who are in darkness, not to the sons of light.
[8] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 5.25.4: Hippolytus, *Antichrist*, 57.

of the Ten Virgins as an argument in support of the practice of virginity.[1]

(5) The last clear tendency is the effect of the immediate needs of Church life or current controversy upon the interpretation of parables. Writers who are anxious to find scriptural arguments in support of their own particular understanding of Christian duty or Christian truth at that moment are only too ready to turn the parables to their own advantage. In some cases they may well be making a correct practical application of the parable in question, as when Cyprian appeals to the Matthaean parable of the Tares as an argument against Novatian's rigorism.[2] On other occasions the interpretations may be entirely original prompted solely by the need of the moment and bearing no real relation to the meaning of the parable at all. This has clearly happened in the case of Epiphanius' use of the parable of the Ten Virgins quoted above. But the application of the parable may not necessarily be based simply on one term in the parable; it may be rightly based on the relational situation of the parable, while still being a very dubious interpretation. Such, for example, is the case with Tertullian's use of the same parable of the Ten Virgins where the wise had not enough oil for themselves and for their companions as an argument against the right of martyrs to absolve the sins of others.[3]

Such are the explicit canons of interpretation and the implicit tendencies in the actual work of exegesis, which are to be found in the earliest Christian writers whose works have come down to us. In his book, *The Parables of Jesus*, Professor Jeremias shows that the work of interpretation by the Church has already affected the parables in the period before the writing of the Gospels. If that is so, we should expect the influence of this ecclesiastical interpretation to be along the same lines as can clearly be seen in the later Church's handling of the actual Gospel material. This in fact proves to be the case. The tendencies which we have observed directly at work are

[1] Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 67.2. This kind of argument might seem to be so clearly false as to be unthinkable on the part of any serious scholar today. Yet in L. H. Marshall's *The Challenge of New Testament Ethics* (1946), p. 117, the existence of the parable about a king deciding whether to go to war is apparently used as an argument against pacifism.

[2] Cyprian, *Epp.*, 54.3, 55.24.

[3] Tertullian, *De Pud.*, 22.

closely similar to those postulated by Professor Jeremias on inferential grounds. The Christian preacher or teacher, bent on interpreting the Lord's message, used, according to Jeremias, two main methods for the achievement of his purpose. He might use the allegorical method (as Matthew does) or he might add a generalising conclusion (the method favoured by Luke or his sources).[1] These correspond to the first two implicit tendencies already noted.

The third tendency was the habit of discussing a group of parables together and interpreting them in the light of one another. This is closely parallel to the collection and fusion of parables, which Jeremias believes to have been one of the characteristic activities of the primitive Church.[2]

The fourth tendency was that of finding the point of interest and the key to the interpretation not in the parable as a whole, but in some particular item within it. This, too, corresponds to tendencies described by Jeremias. An original merchant in the Matthaean form of the parable of the Talents has become a king in Luke[3]; an original man in the Lucan form of the parable of the Great Supper has become a king in Matthew.[4]

The original 'crisis' parable about going before the Judge has been interpreted *simpliciter* by Matthew as straightforward advice on the subject of reconciliation.[5] The reference to money in the parable of the Unjust Steward has given rise to the belief that the right use of money is its real subject matter and has led to the addition of v. 9 to point this moral.[6] All these suggestions of Jeremias are illustrations of this fourth tendency.

The fifth tendency was the influence of the immediate Church situation. This is also one of the principles of transformation postulated by Jeremias. It shows itself particularly in finding illustrations to meet the needs of the missionary Church and explanations of the delay of the Parousia. Suggested examples are the insertion of the Wedding-Garment parable into the Matthaean version of the parable of the Great Supper, and the change of a number of 'crisis' parables into Parousia parables.[7]

[1] op. cit., p. 87.
[2] ibid., pp. 72-74.
[3] ibid., p. 51.
[4] ibid., p. 53.
[5] ibid., pp. 31, 32.
[6] ibid., pp. 34, 70.
[7] ibid., pp. 36-52.

Thus all the main tendencies that we have noted are seen by Jeremias to have been at work as early as the pre-literary period. These points of correspondence are not, of course, direct proof of any of Jeremias' detailed analysis, but they may be allowed to stand as corroborative evidence that the kind of analysis which he has given is at least likely to be along the right lines.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching. By VINCENT TAYLOR. Macmillan, London. 21s.

THIS is a good and valuable book. It sums up much of Dr Taylor's contribution to New Testament scholarship over the last thirty years. It has the great merit of clarity without shallowness. There is balance and the sense of sound judgment in dealing with complex sets of facts or a multiplicity of theories. It might well be reckoned the best modern statement in English of the New Testament teaching on the person of Christ.

This is the third volume of a trilogy, which together form the Speaker's Lectures given at Oxford in the years 1951-6. In the earlier two volumes on *The Names of Jesus* and *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, Dr Taylor had examined the details of the record of the Incarnation. It is on this scholarly basis that he now sets out his conclusions on New Testament Christology.

This careful method is pursued also within the final volume. In the first part the New Testament books or groups of books are examined in turn to see the actual Christology they bear witness to in their present form. In the second part—but not till then—an attempt is made to trace the development of the primitive tradition.

Dr Taylor begins with St. Mark, in which he believes we find a clear and vivid presentation of this early tradition about Jesus' human nature, His Messiahship, the use of the title 'Son of Man', the teaching on the Holy Spirit and on Christ as the Son of God. This Luke faithfully reproduces with some modification and a preference for speaking of Jesus as the Lord, the title which was to become the dominant one in the early years. There is more interpretation of the tradition in Matthew and much more in the Fourth Gospel, where, for example, the human is fully real as the veil through which the divine shines and the title 'Son of Man' comes to stand for the One whose glory is seen in His human limitations.

In Acts too Dr Taylor finds the early tradition faithfully reproduced with Christ as the Suffering Servant and the Lord, and as yet little reflection on the relation of the Lord and the Spirit. It is in the apostle Paul that we first meet with one of the great New Testament writers who meditates on and develops the tradition, though his immediate influence on the majority who hand on the earlier tradition, and even on Hebrews and John is remarkably small.

He is no innovator. He himself is not only influenced by this tradition, but also gives it a profound interpretation, and introduces new names for Jesus—the image of God, the wisdom of God, the final Adam, the first-born. His Christology is not, despite certain writers, docetic. His most frequent word for Jesus is that of the tradition-Lord, through which he expresses a deep sense of awe, devotion and obedience. When he comes in teaching to interpret who the Lord is, it is then that he finds the concept of Son of God most fruitful. The cosmic greatness of his Lord he sees in Christ's restoration of human nature and His agency in creation itself, and this leads Paul (as it is to lead Hebrews and John) towards a new concept of monotheism as triune. At this point Dr Taylor devotes an excellent chapter to an examination of the modern discussion of Phil. 2.5-11 and concludes that Paul here sees the Son undergoing a great renunciation (which the Philippians are called to copy) rather than as primarily achieving a new and higher status.

There follow chapters on the traditional Christology as truly reflected in 1 Peter along with foreshadowings of later developments and on the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews with its *vere homo, vere Deus* against the background of Alexandrian thought.

With John, in his development of the tradition, we come to probably the greatest influence on Christology. Here is a divine life, yet one subordinate to the Father as Son. Here too is the great expansion of the doctrine of the Spirit as the One who makes clear to men what the coming of the Son means. Dr Taylor sees the difference of emphasis between the Gospel and the first Epistle, especially in the use of expiatory categories, as due to the different audiences addressed, the Epistle being much more directed to those within the tradition.

In the Pastorals and in the other Catholic epistles we meet earlier tradition, unaffected by the great writers, but with its own deep veneration for the Lord, who has really been here as man and who is divine. The same sense of worship shines from the Book of Revelation, where once again in the terms of the early tradition witness is borne to a transcendent Master who has been here as man.

Here are 150 fine pages of exposition, and as their conclusion a valuable appendix on the New Testament use of Lord and Son.

We now come to the second part in which Dr Taylor traces the development of Christology within the New Testament. He begins with Jesus' own consciousness of His person, and bases his exposition not only on the texts which reflect Jesus' sense of Sonship, but also His use of 'Son of Man', His claim to victory over Satan, His words and acts of unique authority, His work as Servant, both vicarious and sacrificial and also consciously chosen. There is a

unique sense of Sonship, and a unique use of Abba addressed to God—realised and applied in certain great moments. 'The Synoptics reveal (better) the form of its manifestation, the Fourth Gospel its quality' (185).

When we now come to the earliest tradition, we find it limited, but certainly not adoptionist. For it venerates one who is David's Lord and whom it worships. Indeed the early confessions and hymns embodied in the tradition show us clearly its deep religious nature.

The high Christology already present in the earliest times is no less shown by the importance of baptism into the name of Christ and of the Lord's Supper and its new covenant in His blood. Limitations are here also—chiefly two. There is not yet much reflection on the relation of the work to the person nor on the relation of the Lord to God. Paul, John and Hebrews do reflect on these and witness to the cosmic reconciliation of the Son, while the mutual love of Father and Son in the Fourth Gospel is the key to a divine unity that is more than monistic. All three have a Logos Christology, even if Paul and Hebrews prefer not to use the word and all three transform the concept.

The last four chapters which follow this very interesting account of the development of New Testament Christology show Dr Taylor's own preferences in recent Christological discussion. Covering a vast area in a short compass they have not the same expert authority as what goes before. Dr Taylor prefers three 'personalities' within the divine life to three 'modes' of the divine being, though his biblical basis might fit either. He also prefers a kenotic statement. This he bases on his conviction that the Synoptics rightly show intense moments of the sense of Sonship in our Lord's life on earth. He holds that this is best explained in terms of potential or latent divine attributes, though others might hold that it is best explained simply in terms of a real human nature. We would all agree that there is self-limitation in the Incarnation, and also that this is a place where we must remain agnostic about what happens in the divine realm, when God stoops down to become man. One is more hesitant in nailing one's flag to the idea of potentiality or in identifying the human nature with the life of the Son when on earth as Dr Taylor seems to do (295). Yet this is a small criticism of the book as a whole and one is entirely with the author when at the end he writes that it is not an intellectual belief which itself creates faith, but the total response of faith which is the basis of our beliefs and that such faith comes not from the Holy Spirit alone, but through the working of the Spirit in Scripture and through the Church.

J. L. M. Haire

Das So-genannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus. By PAUL ALTHAUS. Carl Bertelsmann Verlag, 1958. Pp. 52.

THERE has been no more valuable contribution to the controversy raging round the work of Rudolf Bultmann than this small book. As its title indicates, it deals mainly with the problem of the relation of faith to history, though an excellent last chapter criticises Bultmann's existential Christology.

The title is reminiscent of Martin Kähler's famous book written at the end of last century, which has not yet found an English translator. The new kerygmatic theology of which Bultmann and Gogarten are representatives, claims to be a resumption of Kähler's teaching. Kähler rightly rejected the attempts of the nineteenth-century writers of lives of Jesus to get behind the backs of the Gospel writers, and discover a human Jesus different from the Christ in whom these writers believed, and to whom their Gospels bore witness. The Gospels, he said, were primarily witness and preaching, and not sources for the historian. And yet Kähler believed that in the Gospels we have a picture of Jesus as He was, the real Jesus, portrayed by faith for faith. Thus for Kähler the Gospels are not merely preaching; they make a claim that certain things happened.

Here, Althaus suggests, is where Bultmann and Gogarten depart in a sinister manner from Kähler's position. Kähler is confident that while the Gospel writers were not interested in giving us a description of Christ's inner life, yet His person has left an indelible stamp on their writings. And it was their purpose that it should do so. Bultmann, on the other hand, uses all his scholarship to prove that we really know little or nothing about Jesus. Both he and Gogarten seem to think that, by doing so, they leave a breathing-space for faith; as if any attempt to raise the question of the reliability of the tradition were already a sign of unbelief. This anti-historical attitude Althaus rightly declares to be quite alien to the spirit of the Bible itself.

He further objects to the new definition which Bultmann and Gogarten offer of the term 'historicity' (*Geschichtlichkeit*). Gogarten writes, 'The authentic historicity of the events to which the New Testament bears witness is not to be found in their objective historically verifiable past occurrence, but in the kerygma, in the proclamation . . . of the gracious approach of God to man and the world which occurred in history.'

This definition Althaus declares to be suspect on two grounds. Firstly, it is so different from the usual meaning given to the term 'historicity'; and secondly, it enables Bultmann and Gogarten to declare that it is illegitimate to ask whether the events recorded by the Gospel really happened.

In short, Gogarten's great display of philosophy, and his rude attacks on the critics of Bultmann, as being still in the bonds of an outdated subject-object metaphysic, while he and Bultmann are thinking historically, are really beside the point, and serve only to cloud the issue. The objections of Bultmann's critics are based, not on an outworn metaphysic, but on the New Testament, which is not only a call to decision, but claims, especially in its narrative passages, that certain things really happened.

There remains for Althaus the great problem raised by Lessing and discussed by Kähler and Bultmann, as to how the certainty of faith can be dependent on the at best provisional certainties of historical fact. Here, developing a hint from Karl Heim, he declares that, even short of faith, an intuitive certainty can be gained about the general character of a historical figure in the past. This certainty is of a pre-scientific kind, and there is an analogy between it and the personal trust which can sometimes quickly arise when we meet other people face to face. This historical certainty, however, is not, he says, of such a kind as to render unnecessary the continual investigation and correction in detail which is afforded by the inductive science of history. It would be interesting to hear the comments of the philosophers on this attempted solution of the problem.

This book, which is also valuable for its many references to contemporary German discussions of the problems ventilated, should be translated into English at the earliest opportunity.

DAVID CAIRNS

The Christian Doctrine of History. By JOHN MCINTYRE. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1957. Pp. 119. 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR MCINTYRE contends, and rightly, that the notion of history, so prominent nowadays in Christian discourse, ought to be clarified as part of the structure of Christian *doctrine*. His book is therefore a constructive exercise in dogmatic theology. 'The impression too often given is that history is something in which things happen, a structure in which the events of Revelation and Redemption take place, a framework relatively unaffected by the actions of God and man that occur within it. The further suggestion is often made that, while history is the same for all men, their differences of opinion about it occur at the level of "interpretation" and do not affect the inner nature of the historical process. The purpose of this present study is to demonstrate that the Christian, because of his belief in God's Revelation of Himself in history, is committed to a unique doctrine of history.' (p. 11.)

This definition is offered on p. 13: 'History is meaningful occur-

rence, and more particularly occurrence the meaning of which is a construct out of certain categories, namely, Necessity, Providence, Incarnation, Freedom and Memory.' The word 'category' is preferred to the word 'concept' because the Christian maintains that the terms in which he apprehends history are to be taken with realist intention; i.e. they describe what history really is and how it takes place, not merely how we contrive to interpret it.

Each category is examined under the several aspects which are appropriate in the context of this theological analysis. The forms under which the category of Necessity expresses itself are taken to be: time, geography, socio-economic origin and status, human self-interest, and inner dynamism ('the kind of history-making which goes on over our heads', in Butterfield's phrase). Providence, affirmed here as a Christian category to be understood in intimate relation with God's redemptive work in Christ, has for its pattern: judgment, mercy, and redemptive purpose. Freedom occurs within a structure of necessity, grace and self-hood. Memory, which mediates the past to the present, has a dual bearing, briefly but adequately clarified.

At the centre of the discussion stands a treatment of the part which Incarnation plays in the construction of history. The analysis of this category occupies half the book. It is a complex category, whose formal effect is to assert that history comprises *fulfilment* and takes place by fulfilment. Here the author proceeds by way of comment on four accounts of 'fulfilment' (Marsh, Hebert, R. Mackintosh and Bultmann). The result is decisive enough but could have been made explicit at the end of this long and creative discussion. The account of the category in its formal aspect has to be filled out by a discussion of *what* is fulfilled and we are shown how to regard the Incarnation as redemptive and recreative (a section which should have been less terse and epigrammatic), as creative, as prospective (an admirable discussion of eschatology), and as integrative.

The book serves in very many respects to dispel muddle and to clear up ambiguities in Christian talk about history. But in the course of this salutary work it communicates most powerfully the claims which Christians now realise have to be made in this field. (I accept the author's point that this is a *novel* concern in Christian doctrine and that appeals to the biblical doctrine of time or of history are anachronistic). It has clarity of vision and power of expression sufficient to make the reader a different person. And it is a business-like work, calculated to make the technical historian take notice.

One could be rude about the style. I imagine that it reflects

Americo-Antipodean contexts, where a member of the class who does not pick up with ease every bit of the professorial jargon and every professorial allusion convicts himself of being unbusiness-like in the discipline of theology. Every paragraph confronts the reader with a clear Either/Or: either the precise meaning hits him unambiguously and with power; or he gets nothing at all. It is a bracing climate for those who can stand it.

There is a missing 'not' on p. 74, l. 28. On the following page there is what I can only regard as an *obiter dictum* of the most provoking kind. The line of secular history differs from the *Heilsgeschichte* in that 'whereas the latter is prophetic of the Divine nature of the Incarnate Lord, it is prophetic of the human nature'. This is the only place in the book where I can neither follow the working nor (I think) agree with the result.

W. A. Whitehouse

A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. By William D. Maxwell. Oxford University Press, 1955. Pp. 185 and index. 15s.

If it were not presumption for a stranger to do so, the reviewer would strongly recommend these, the Baird Lectures for 1953, to the attention of both the Scottish Churches. They would each of them learn here much that is commonly forgotten about the worship and devotional practice of their own forebears, and perceive how little divergent at times have been their ways of worship, however divergent their temper.

The first two lectures, on the early worship of the Celts and Scots, and on medieval worship in Scotland, have but little bearing on the rest, serving chiefly to show what the Reformation was a necessary protest against. The suggestion made here that there was, even for a short time, a vernacular Celtic liturgy seems hardly supported by the evidence: for there was in the West a theory (which is true of French, Italian, and Spanish) that the native languages were different ways of speaking Latin badly, and that it would be irreverent to use them in worship. It appears that, whatever its previous practice, the Scottish Church was persuaded by St. Margaret to adopt English ways: in fact (though Dr Maxwell has not had need to mention it) both John Balliol and John Snell in their days were anxious for young Scotsmen to learn English habits and transport them back to Scotland. The medieval English use, despite the small variants of which too much is made, was Roman in all essentials: and this the Scottish Church was content to copy.

The next three lectures form the most interesting part of this book. In that on the Reformation we are informed of many matters of which at least one Englishman was culpably ignorant. It appears

that the second Edwardian Prayer Book was adopted in Scotland immediately on its appearance, and continued in use during the English reaction under Mary. Afterwards, under the influence of John Knox, who had at first approved of the English book, forms of worship from Strassburg and Geneva tended to supplant it. We learn that the Scottish reformers had what would now be called a 'high' doctrine of the Eucharist: they reintroduced, apparently without objection, the anamnesis and epiclesis which the second Edwardian book had dropped. The Church suffered from a shortage of competent ministers, so that the reformers' ideal of a weekly communion was unattainable; in any case, perhaps we could add, the popular dislike of reception of the sacrament (an evil heritage from the middle ages, from which after four centuries we still suffer) would have stultified the reformers' efforts: the holy communion commits men to something, and they know it, and are not prepared to be committed.

What we find in Scotland in the late sixteenth century is the reader's service of scripture-reading and psalmody, followed as often as possible (which in country places was infrequently) by the minister's service of preaching and prayer. Worship was not confined to Sundays. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments were in regular use. Marriages were solemnised in church. The dead were buried without any service at all. It was not long before English puritanism began to exert its malign influence upon Scottish worship, though this problem did not become acute until the Great Rebellion.

The account in Lecture IV of the changes proposed by James and Charles throws new light on an old subject. An English churchman now visiting the High Kirk of Glasgow, or even more the High Kirk of Edinburgh, and perceiving among their furniture and adornment things for which English clergymen were being prosecuted less than a century ago, is driven to wonder what in the seventeenth century all the trouble was about. Certainly the two kings made mistakes of tactics: but there was so little difference between the so-called Laudian book (which was not Laudian, but the work of the Aberdeen doctors) and what had been common, though not universal, custom for half a century, that it must appear that the agitation was artificially organised in the interests of the landowners who objected to the restitution to the Church of the tithes they had impropriated. Contrary to common opinion, the Scottish Church was not greatly interested in the Westminster Assembly (which was an English parliamentary commission) and only with reluctance and under protest accepted the Directory. The English puritans having objected to the reading of Scripture in church, the 'reader's service'

was now dropped, and 'lecturing' by the minister (which meant the piecemeal reading of Scripture with interpolated comments) was substituted for it. About the same time there came in the reprehensible practice of 'lining', which your reviewer himself heard in an Original Secession church in Glasgow as late as 1909.

The restoration of the monarchy, and the 'second episcopate', did not succeed in restoring either the Scottish or the English ways of worship lost during the rebellion. Apparently all ministers now extemporised (or professed to extemporise) their prayers, and the only difference between an episcopalian and a presbyterian was that the former used the Doxology, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, while the latter did not: the Ten Commandments had already disappeared. Communion became very infrequent: in Glasgow only twice in the twenty-eight years of the second episcopate. Two notable things in Dr Maxwell's fifth lecture are, first, a description of a celebration of the holy communion on the open hillside in the midst of thunder and rain, where (with something akin to emotion) one feels with him that 'impressive it is, indeed: impressive, with all its curiousness, as containing something great and holy, which in that form we shall not see again'. The other thing is an account of the administration of absolution (or the refusal of it) after public admonition and penance: on which we observe that there was a form of absolution (p. 150) far more sacerdotal than anything Canterbury has ever used, and that the open humiliation and virulence of invective were such that one can only wonder at the cowed and cowering public opinion which allowed the minister to get away with it.

The sixth lecture, on the renaissance of worship, besides its narrative, contains some wise criticisms of dubious practices, and the honourable mention of some notable names.

A few corrections may be noted. On p. 16 something has gone wrong with *tui*: does it stand for *intuere*? On p. 41 'dismay' (l. 3) should perhaps be 'decay'. On p. 54 close the quotation after 'Common Order'. On p. 59 'deficient' seems to stand for 'defective'. On p. 71, n. 2, read 'of re-ordaining'. On p. 85 read 'they were' for 'it was'. On p. 171 the reference to Dr Pusey is misconceived: any canon is required to keep the customs approved or imposed by the dean; the custom in question continued at Christ Church until at least 1920, but has now (to the regret of some of us) been discontinued.

A few general remarks may perhaps be permitted. The origins and progress of the Scottish reformation are no doubt better known north of the Tweed than south of it: one was surprised to find that so much progress had been made by 1550: perhaps an interpolated paragraph or footnote in a second edition would elucidate this.

One has heard (it is in all the school histories) of King James' objection to presbytery: and one has wondered what his objection was, if Andrew Melville and some others one knows of were good representatives of it, and if the church polity here described was as generally accepted as appears in this third lecture. Also one wonders why there was the break with the Church of England if the ministers were as reasonable and withal as 'high-church' as it now appears: and one suspects that the reason was not objection to the Prayer Book (which was not typically English) but fear of dominance by the more populous nation—a laudable sentiment which has had unfortunate results. Apparently Aytoun's reference to 'the black Geneva ministers' will have to be corrected: they wore blue.

Your reviewer is under obligation to the Church of Scotland for the youthful experience of 'something great and holy'. He takes this opportunity of acknowledging that obligation and of thanking Dr Maxwell for reminding him of it. He also hopes that this book will receive the attention and the approval which it so well deserves.

E. Evans

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection from the Dead? By Oscar Cullmann. Epworth Press. 6s.

Professor Cullman is sensitive to the kind of reception given to his books, and so he devotes seven out of the sixty pages of this book to a Preface in which he describes the criticisms levelled against it in its original French edition and also the reasons which have impelled him to give it the wider circulation of translation. 'No other publication of mine', he says, 'has provoked such enthusiasm or such violent hostility. Friends who have followed my previous work with interest and approval have indicated to me the pain which this study has caused them.'

The thesis of the book (which is the Ingersoll Lecture on the Immortality of Man for 1955) is familiar enough in biblical and theological circles, and it usually provokes just such enthusiasm or opposition. It is that there is no evidence in the Bible for the doctrine of the natural immortality of all souls, that that has come in (with much other error, as some would say) from Greek philosophy, and that the genuine biblical doctrine is new life by resurrection. Professor Cullman argues on purely exegetical grounds that there is a radical difference between the Christian hope of resurrection and the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul, and he complains—justly enough—that his critics have not met him on exegesis, but have intruded arguments of a philosophical, psychological or sentimental character. In this book the discussion is confined to the New

Testament, but it may be noted that most Old Testament Scholars would agree that there is nothing in man *qua* man which survives death; but this is not to be taken as ruling out from the Old Testament any hope of life after death. The Hebrew conception of the personality is an animated body, not an incarnate soul.

Professor Cullman begins his argument by a comparison of the death of Socrates and of Jesus Christ. For Socrates death is 'the soul's great friend', for Jesus Christ 'the last enemy' to be conquered. Immortality is only a *negative* assertion; the soul does not die, but simply lives on. Resurrection is a *positive* assertion; the whole man who has really died is recalled to life by a new act of creation by God. The argument unfolds the relationship of sin and death which from Genesis onwards to Paul is interpreted as the result of man's sin. The soul can be destroyed, because it is not by nature immortal —and Jesus' words in Matt. 10.28 are quoted in support of this. Sin and death cannot be conquered by man, but only by God; and He has accomplished this in the Resurrection of His Son. Hence we live in the new era in which death is conquered. Those who have lived and died 'in Christ' will share that victory; but their own resurrection will not take place until the End. Then, only then, will the dead in Christ be raised, not as fleshly bodies but as spiritual bodies. At this point Cullman disagrees with Barth who teaches that the great transformation of the body occurs for everyone immediately after the individual's death. This conception of an interim-state before we attain resurrection at the End is one which, he says, has given 'great sorrow and distress' to his critics; but he maintains that it is genuine primitive Christianity.

Professor Cullman is not primarily a systematic theologian, and so he has not drawn out the doctrinal implications of his position to the full. Those who cannot believe it possible that the rule of God should be confronted eternally with a realm of evil dismiss accordingly the theory of Eternal Punishment. The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul seems to point inevitably to the view of ultimate universal restoration. A soul that is by nature immortal cannot be destroyed. The view of primitive Christianity expounded by Cullman makes more credible the theory of conditional or potential immortality. For evangelism it is a central issue.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Faith, Hope and Love. By EMIL BRUNNER. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

THIS is an easy and pleasant book to read, and yet it is a remarkable survey of a great theme. The three lectures were delivered at Berkeley, California, in 1955; and Professor Brunner claims that, so far as he knows, the theme had never been treated in this syste-

matic way before. What he has in view is the 'meaning, the unity and the difference of the three concepts', and this of course is essentially a theological study.

The key to the understanding of the essential 'threeness' and 'oneness' of these concepts lies, in Brunner's view, in the basic fact of man's existence as a human being in the three dimensions of time. The kernel of New Testament teaching is that 'we live in the past by faith; we live in the future by hope; we live in the present by love'. So all three are equally essential and total. Brunner does not seem to acknowledge that there is much substance in Paul's assertion that 'the greatest of these is love'—but that is surely true, for in man's existence faith and hope cannot survive where love is wanting; there would be little reason why they should, and this is why Paul puts the greatest of all after the other two.

In the Chapter on Faith, it is made very clear that faith is a relationship to historical events, 'historical factuality', in which we meet God as in no other events and no other religions. The second chapter on Hope examines the kind of hope which is biblical, in face of the apparent defeat of the Cross; and the chapter is largely taken up with a piercing examination of the idea of belief in general progress—which is not a Christian idea, which is only two centuries old and is now severely shaken. The final chapter on Love defines it as God's way of changing our present. It derives peculiarly from God Himself; and it is love, not reason, that makes us truly human.

In the course of this book, Brunner says many important things—just in a short, crisp sentence—on such subjects as how alone we can grasp Christ, how Christ takes our guilt upon Himself, how a highly organised society tends to become inhuman, how secularism must end in totalitarianism, how Good Friday is D-day and Easter V-day, how the New Testament disowns the idea of natural, personal immortality, how Utopianism is a friendly but a terrible illusion, how the gist of the Gospel lies in Christ's overcoming of the world, and how we ourselves cannot do a thing against death. By such sentences active minds will be greatly stimulated.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Theological Essays. By F. D. MAURICE, with an Introduction by E. F. CARPENTER. James Clarke. Pp. 331. 15s.

THEOLOGY, like any other subject, has its fashions, and there can be little doubt that F. D. Maurice is enjoying a certain vogue in some Anglican circles at present. Indeed (like P. T. Forsyth) he may be receiving rather greater attention than during his lifetime.

It is therefore all to the good to have a reprint of the second (and greatly improved) edition of the *Theological Essays*, though a pub-

lisher who would be prepared to sponsor a reprint of *The Kingdom of Christ* would put us still further in his debt. In the opinion of many good authorities this is a far more important book and unfortunately at the moment it is almost unobtainable.

The present work, however, displays most of the qualities which make Maurice a significant theologian. It is the work of a singularly honest mind which gives the fullest weight to the objections of opponents. He is always alive to the wider, and particularly to the social applications of his theme. This is particularly strongly marked in his Essay on Regeneration in the present collection. He has no inclination to turn theology into a particular branch of technology. He sees the biblical Faith as an organic whole and finds it rooted in and confirmed by human experience. This clearly emerges in his Essay on Sin, but even more strikingly in his appeal to the unconscious gropings of popular Greek religion towards the idea of an Incarnation. Here the analogy with another Platonist, the apologist Justin, is striking. He can even welcome the attempts to reduce sin to circumstance and the light shed by materialist psychology not only because, however hard they are pushed, they are bound to prove themselves inadequate, but also for the elements of truth which they contain. Yet his sympathy with his opponents does not blind him to the inadequacies of their views. They are not liveable in the way in which the Christian Revelation is a sure foundation for human life. In the Essay on Eternal Life and Eternal Death which was to cost him his chair at King's College, London, we are more likely to be impressed by its fundamental orthodoxy than its dangerous liberalism. If his doctrine of the Atonement rejects the crude Substitutionism of much contemporary thinking, it is far from being Abelardian in tone.

Yet the work has obvious defects. Some belong to the period, others to the texture of his own mind, others again to the nature of the controversies in which he was engaged. The middle of the nineteenth century was a period of half-faith in which the influence of Christianity, though subject to serious challange, was more pervasive than it is today. Maurice could therefore take much for granted about the nature of man and its implications for theology. Our contemporaries may, however, find his defence of the Faith less than convincing; from their point of view it goes off at half-cock. His impact upon the Unitarians to whom the Essays were directed may be difficult to assess; at least he was well within earshot of their premises. A modern reader would need to push the argument several stages further back before moving towards Maurice's conclusions. To modern taste the style is turgid. There is little of Newman's charm of style or J. B. Mozley's clarity of treatment.

There is in this book (though not in others from his pen) a certain lack of insistence upon the 'factuality' of the Christian Revelation, which reads strangely to a modern theologian nurtured on *Heilsgeschichte*. Here no doubt Maurice's Platonic background counted for much. He was more interested in the abiding significance of the Christian facts than in events *qua* events. This impression is strongly confirmed by his Essay on the Resurrection.

Few Anglicans of his period understood Luther half so well, but others will be able to judge whether he is entirely fair to Calvinism. Here the influence of Erskine of Linlathen was undoubtedly strong and his reaction against a stereotyped and ossified Evangelicalism. His strictures against those who made the doctrine of the Fall the focus of their theology and who accentuated the negative implication of Predestinationism are obviously just, but neither are the central themes of the system which he is criticising. His reaction against certain views of inspiration was no doubt timely, but his Essay on the subject, although addressed to a kindly critic who asked him to open his mind more fully, leaves us somewhat in the air. Perhaps his protest against false clarities made it difficult for him to be clear-cut himself. He is rightly in reaction against the 'external evidence' school of Christian Apologetic. The Christian Faith itself and its response to deep human need is its own best apologetic. That is well insisted, especially in its historical context. Even Butler, despite many warm tributes, does not come too well out of the book.

Some greater clarity and more precision of outline would have made a better book. Maurice maintains that the articles of the Christian Faith, if seen in the light of the Divine Charity, acquire unity and distinctness. The whole work is informed by just such a spirit of charity. The unity of the Christian Faith is brilliantly unfolded. It is perhaps in the attainment (or is it merely the presentation?) of that distinctness that the main weakness of the work is to be found.

H. E. W. TURNER

Introducing New Testament Theology. By A. M. HUNTER. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 160. 10s. 6d.

THIS small book can be warmly commended to those for whom it is primarily intended, 'the hard-working parson who wants to keep up to date theologically, and the theological student'. Dr Hunter defends himself against the charge of not being exhaustive, but it may be hoped that his book will prove so successful that he will feel led to provide an expanded version so as to include interpreters, like the authors of the Pastoral Epistles and of Revelation, who find no place here.

Part One, 'The Fact of Christ', deals with the ministry of Jesus as the inauguration of the Kingdom of God and with the Resurrection as at once both the climax of Jesus' own ministry and the point of transition to its continuation in the missionary activity of the Church. Part Two, 'The First Preachers of the Fact', discusses the *kerygma*, and 'The Interpreters of the Fact' in Part Three are St. Paul, St. Peter, the writer to the Hebrews and the author of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles. While allowing full weight to differences, Dr Hunter is concerned, as we expect, to bring out 'the unity of the New Testament' (the title of an earlier work from his pen). It can be conceded that a kerygmatic unity pervades much of the New Testament and, with due allowance for different emphases, this is broadly true also of what may be termed the victorious Christologies. But to say that ' "Christ the High Priest over the House of God" is really only another way of saying "Christ the Head of the Body" ' (p. 122) is an over-simplification. Dr Hunter has much more to say, because there is in fact much more to be said, of the theological unity underlying the differences between the Pauline and Johannine interpretations of 'the Fact'. The treatment of 'Christianity according to St. Paul' (pp. 90-110) is a masterpiece of compression and lucidity.

'Finalise' (e.g. p. 50) is an unfortunate blemish; on p. 72 Acts 8.37 should be described as the Western, not 'the D. text'.

A. J. B. Higgins

Jesus and His Coming. By J. A. T. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 192. 15s.

That the argument of this book is learned and closely reasoned is undeniable, and it contains much of real value independently of its main thesis.

In his introduction Dr Robinson draws an analogy between the doctrine of the First Things, with which an earlier generation was so concerned, and that of the Last Things, as regards which, in his opinion, the Church today stands in much the same position as it formerly did in regard to the former. The fact is true, but not the analogy. If it is now axiomatic that the creation story in Genesis is mythological, ancient folk-lore, of which Genesis contains the deposit, is in quite a different category from the distinctively Christian Parousia belief which appears in a fully developed form in the Thessalonian epistles a mere twenty years after the crucifixion. Moreover, it does not follow that, because a doctrine like that of the Second Advent lies outside the modern perspective and is therefore unacceptable, it does not belong to the earliest tradition, or even that it does not stem ultimately from the teaching of Jesus Himself.

While Dr Robinson does not say so in so many words, the reader is hardly to be blamed for getting the very strong impression that it is precisely with this implicit presupposition that he approaches the matter.

The author acknowledges his debt to Dr Glasson's *The Second Advent*, and their views are indeed very similar. Although distributed through most of the New Testament, 'the promise of His coming' is nowhere attributed to Jesus in the epistles, and 'no evidence is to be found that the *Parousia* expectation formed part of the earliest strata of Apostolic Christianity' (p. 29). Is it then at all likely, one may well ask, that the Parousia hope as it is usually understood goes back to Jesus? The only place to seek an answer is in the Synoptic Gospels. From an examination of Mark 14.62 and similar passages Dr Robinson concludes that Jesus looked to a Parousia 'in the sense of a coming to appear before the presence of God' (cf. Dan. 7.13; p. 58), though not in that of a glorious return which the Church ascribed to Him. The Parousia language is but one of several ways, like resurrection and session, of describing His assurance of immediate vindication by God. The crisis (following Dodd and Jeremias) to which the eschatological parables originally referred is not the Parousia of the Son of Man, but the situation produced by the challenge of Jesus and His message in the contemporary situation. It is the Church which replaced the ministry of Jesus as the real climax with the Second Coming. In His teaching there is 'no "coming of the Son of man" which does *not* refer to this ministry, its climax and its consequences' (p. 81).

Dr Robinson thinks it is possible to establish that it is only in the later strata of the Synoptic tradition that there is any counterpart to the Parousia doctrine of the epistles. This curious fact (if it is a fact) he attributes to a time-lag on the part of the Synoptic tradition, 'a resistance to purely ecclesiastical motifs'. What, however, was the place of the Gospel tradition about Jesus in the early Church? If it was in ecclesiastical use, how could it have resisted 'ecclesiastical motifs'? I believe that Professor H. Riesenfeld's recent magistral treatment of *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (1957) is closely relevant here. He contends that the Gospel tradition of the teaching of Jesus as 'holy word' is *sui generis*, and that the epistles provide examples of exposition of this teaching. Both missionary preaching and community instruction were linked to the tradition of Jesus, but as is clear from the New Testament outside the Gospels, it was rarely quoted. This provides a clue which is far more likely to lead to solid results than the solution proposed by Dr Robinson. It would give a perfectly natural explanation of the absence in the epistles of attribution to Jesus of, among other things, the Parousia doctrine. Once

this is admitted the whole thesis of the present work collapses. And if the apocalyptic passages in the Thessalonian epistles are based on the tradition as preserved in the Synoptics at the very early date of composition of these epistles there can be no question of later or secondary strata in that tradition. A further weakness in Dr Robinson's treatment is that he fails to provide any alternative to the view that Jesus' institution of the Eucharist suggests that He envisaged an interval, whether long or short, the period of the Church, to use Cullmann's terminology, between His death and the Parousia.

While it is increasingly recognised that the Fourth Gospel preserves much that is of no little historical value and that its form of the tradition of the words of Jesus demands serious consideration, Dr Robinson's view that its tradition may be more primitive and more reliable than the Synoptic tradition because it had not, in his judgment, succumbed to later apocalyptic tendencies is not calculated to win wide assent, and is too precarious to be applied as support to a structure already sufficiently unstable.

The fact remains that, with due allowance for accretion and distortion at certain points in the tradition, the most natural explanation of the Parousia hope in the New Testament is that it originates in the teaching of Jesus Himself. The burden of proof still lies with those who would dispute this.

A. J. B. Higgins

The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (second edition). By S. G. F. Brandon. S.P.C.K., London, 1957. 30s.

The first edition of this book has already been reviewed at some length in this Journal (see *SJT*, vol. 6, pp. 437ff), and the second is in the main a reprint, so that an extensive notice would not appear to be called for. The author has added three additional notes on the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the formation of the *Corpus Paulinum*, and the date of the Markan Apocalypse. It might perhaps have been expected that opportunity would be taken to include some discussion of points raised in criticism, or of recent literature on the subject, *sed auctori aliter visum*. It must suffice to note that Schoeps has followed his *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* by another study (*Urgemeinde—Judenchristentum—Gnosis*, 1956), that on more conventional lines Goppelt has provided a comprehensive study of the relations between the Church and Judaism in the early centuries (*Christentum und Judentum*, 1954), and that John Knox has attempted to reconstruct Paul's career on the basis of the Epistles rather than of Acts (*Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 1950). The last-named work, which appeared about the same time as Brandon's first edition,

provides an interesting example for comparison of the results achieved when scholars abandon the safe channel charted by tradition and launch out into the open sea. Both Brandon and Knox are aware of problems in the conventional interpretation of Christian origins, and both attempt to solve them (although Brandon deals with a much wider field); but their conclusions are often strikingly different. It makes one wonder.

The book is unconventional, but not for that reason to be simply dismissed. It draws attention to certain factors of which too little notice has been taken, and it raises some important questions. Moreover it bears on every page the evidence of wide knowledge and hard thinking. For all this the author has placed us greatly in his debt. But at least one reader remains unconvinced. The book is a real stimulus to thought and reflection, but it is by no means certain that Brandon's reconstruction of the early history of Christianity is more adequate than the one he seeks to replace. Detailed criticism would require a book, but one point may suffice: if Mark is 'a product of the immediate aftermath of the fateful events of A.D. 70' (p. 271), when the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem was 'in the news' and the triumphal procession of the conquerors had provided 'an occasion calculated to excite the keenest interest in the fate of Jewish institutions', then why so little reflection of the actual events of the catastrophe? The situation would in fact appear to be met by a date for Mark after the beginning of the Jewish War but before the Fall of Jerusalem, i.e. between 66 and 70—which is precisely the period commonly accepted. Again, while Mark was no doubt original in undertaking the composition of a Gospel, the Prologue to Luke at least suggests a number of attempts to commit the primitive tradition to writing. On many points the view taken by the author is not the only one, nor the most probable.

R. McL. Wilson

Les Deux Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament XIa). By Charles Masson. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris, 1957. Swiss fr. 8.50.

The latest volume of the *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, from the pen of Professor Masson of Lausanne, is devoted to the Thessalonian epistles and may be thoroughly commended as a veritable *multum in parvo*. A brief introduction deals first with the strategic situation of Thessalonica and then with Paul's visit to the city. Following Haenchen, Masson argues that the account in Acts is telescoped, and that the visit actually lasted for some months. The Church was mainly Gentile, and the first letter was probably written from Corinth. With some other scholars, Masson sees evidence of a tension

within the Church, and thinks it possible that Paul was replying to a letter, probably from the leaders and not from the Church as a whole. On 2 Thess., he goes against recent critics in holding that this letter is not authentic, which involves a somewhat longer discussion; but he maintains that to say the letter is not authentic does not detract from its value.

The commentary proper runs smoothly and without a break, the necessary discussion of critical details being for the most part relegated to footnotes. Here there is useful consideration of particular words, with due attention to Kittel's *Wörterbuch* and to Bauer. Careful account is taken of the various possibilities in interpretation, but Masson avoids overloading the text with a detailed *Auseinandersetzung mit der Literatur*. The reader will, however, find ample guidance as to the opinions which have been advanced, and references to recent studies are frequent and remarkably up-to-date.

The most unsatisfactory feature is that the translation is always set at the top of the page, although the commentary on the passage may not begin for several lines. On p. 107, for example, we have five lines given to the translation of 2.13-14, then thirty-five which complete the excursus on 2.1-12, and finally three lines at the foot of the page which begin the commentary on the passage at the top. It is a small point, perhaps, but it leads to confusion, and it would seem to be quite easily remedied. As it is, at this point the interpolation of the translation breaks the run of the excursus. A few misprints have been noted, but these are mostly unimportant.

Particularly worthy of note is the practical bent of the volume, for Masson has kept modern issues in mind. Thus an excursus is devoted to the significance of 1 Thess. 4. 13-18 for the Church today, another to the meaning of 2 Thess. 2. 1-12 for the Church. And it is refreshing to find an editor admitting that Paul may possibly not be bound by the canons of modern logic.

The bibliography shows that Masson has used all the major critical studies (but Moffatt is still mis-spelt); that of Rigaux appeared only after the work had been completed. Here there is a striking contrast: Rigaux has 754 pages, Masson 116. This may speak for itself. The reader who looks for a convenient study, thorough without being technical, will find here all that he requires.

R. McL. Wilson

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by F. L. Cross. Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. 1492. 70s. net.

An immense amount of learning and information is packed into this massive volume making it an extremely useful and comprehensive

book of reference invaluable to the student and the scholar as well as to the general reader. The articles are commendably brief and clearly written, while thousands of brief bibliographies are scattered throughout its pages greatly enhancing its value. Every time this reviewer has actually consulted it for factual information or to check his memory he has not been disappointed. That is perhaps the best commendation that one can give a work of this kind. It is undoubtedly an outstanding book of reference, especially in the field of historical Christianity and ecclesiastical institutions.

One of the values of this work is the proportionate attention given to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the nature of the case a disciplined selection of material has had to govern the range, the choice of material, and the comparative size of the articles, and it is inevitable that some with special interests should be a little disappointed. Most people in Britain will welcome the fact that 'fuller attention has been paid to Western Christendom than to later Eastern Orthodoxy, to Christianity in Britain than to that of the Continent, to the events of the nineteenth century than to those of the tenth', although the editor adds that 'this disproportion is only relative', but if the editor had been more accurate he would have admitted that disproportionate attention had also been paid to the Church of England. Our main quarrel with this work, however, must not be with the fact that so much attention has been paid to the Church of England, but that far too many articles on matters outwith the Church of England have sinned against scientific objectivity in their obtrusion of an Anglican bias. One would have expected in a work of this kind to have had a separate article on the Church of Scotland, as on the Church of England, and that the articles on historical Christianity in Scotland should have been as accurate and careful as those on historical Christianity in England, but what can one expect when hardly a Scottish scholar appears in the list of contributors? Some of the articles on the Reformation reflect deplorable ignorance and bad judgment.

But when all that is said it must be admitted without any cavil that taken as a whole this is a magnificent production. An immense amount of work has obviously been put into it by the editor, and who but F. L. Cross could have undertaken it and carried it through so well? The Oxford University Press are to be congratulated on an invaluable publication. It is a pity, however, that it should be called the *Oxford* Dictionary of the Christian Church when in point of fact it is essentially an *Anglican* Dictionary.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 3 Auflage. Band I: A-C. Edited by KURT GALLING, in co-operation with H. F. v. CAMPENHAUSEN, E. DINKLER, G. GLOEGE, and K. E. LOGSTRUP. J. C. B. MOHR. Paul Siebeck, Tübingen, 1956-7. Pp. 1898. Subscription price, DM. 78.80.

A THIRD edition of *RGG* is an event of world-wide theological importance. This joint enterprise under the general editorship of Professor Galling is undertaken by a great galaxy of German scholars assisted by others from Scandinavia, Holland, Switzerland, France, Britain and America. A comparison of this first volume with its corresponding number in the second edition makes it clear that the advance from *RGG* 2 to *RGG* 3 is as great as that from *RGG* 1 to *RGG* 2. The change from Gothic to Latin type will be welcomed by most people outside Germany. Otherwise the format remains much the same, but there is a marked improvement in the size of the bibliographies.

Many of the outstanding scholars of the twentieth century contributed to the second edition more than twenty-five years ago, and some of their work is carried forward after revision and addition into this new edition, but judging from the first volume this is to be commended also on its own merits as an outstanding work, indeed a great compact library of many theological and historical works quite indispensable to every University and College. The increase in size has not yet forced the dropping of the old subtitle *Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*! The emphasis, however, appears much the same, with longer articles on religions, religious history and archaeology etc. than on straight theological subjects. As against that, however, it must be added that the emphasis upon biblical studies and biblical theology reflects present-day trends. Judging from the list of contributors the majority of well-known names are of scholars in these fields.

Some articles of outstanding importance and interest for readers of *SJT* may be noted. Fifty pages (as against 35 in *RGG* 2) are devoted to the Lord's Supper. The NT account is presented very fairly by E. Schweizer, although he might have carried over more of the fine contribution of K. L. Schmidt in the former edition. The historical discussion is by H. Grass, who apparently makes no use of the monumental work of Darwell Stone and does not seem to know the work of de la Taille. The Lutheran and Reformed teaching is well expounded by Sommerlath and Kreck, while Gollwitzer contributes a good but comparatively brief article on Intercommunion.

The sections on the Early Church, its art and literature, in this volume are excellently done, but the space and attention given to

patristic theology is a little disappointing to the British student. Henry Chadwick has a very short article on Alexandrian theology, while Schneemelcher has an even briefer one on the great Athanasius. Too much, incidentally, seems to be left to this scholar which makes one wonder whether there is not a dearth of patristic studies in Germany today. Augustine is more adequately treated by Lorenz.

Twenty pages as against six in the previous edition (does this have theological significance?) are devoted to anthropology, scientific and philosophical as well as theological anthropology, with a very excellent article by Otto Weber on the history of the doctrine of man. Considerable attention is also given to a theology of work with its ethical and sociological implications. A very valuable series of articles is presented on the Bible, languages, text, hermeneutics, the doctrine of Scripture (by Gloege), the use of the Bible in instruction in Church and mission, while archaeological contributions come from Galling, G. E. Wright, Dinkler, and others. Hempel and Riesenfeld write on the biblical theology of OT and NT respectively. The sections on the Covenant are, to this reviewer at any rate, a little disappointing.

How far *RGG* lives up to its title of *Religion in Gegenwart* can be judged from many new items, on Barth (by Gloege) and Barmen (by Ernst Wolff, who also gives us a superb account of the historical development of Christianity), on Antisemitism and Atom-bombs, while the study of the Qumran texts leaves its mark in many different fields.

Perhaps the most interesting part of this volume is that given over to Christology with articles by Sevenster on the Christology of the Early Church (replacing that of Martin Dibelius in *RGG* 2), of Pannenberg on the history of Christological dogma—a brilliant contribution—and P. Althaus on the systematic account of the doctrine of Christ. The comparison of these three essays with their earlier counterparts yields an illuminating commentary on the advance of theological thought, in spite of the fact that it is Althaus and not Vogel or Schlink who writes the last of the trilogy.

How much every field of knowledge owes to the encyclopaedic productions of Germany! Here once again is the beginning of a new theological dictionary which is accurate and right up to date and of immense usefulness. It is a sign of the times that this is more international in character and production than its predecessors, which augurs all the better for its welcome and circulation all over the world.

Thomas F. Torrance

Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers. Edited by G. H. Williams and A. M. Mergil—The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXV—London, S.C.M. Press, 1957. 35s.

'Truth is immortal' was a favourite maxim of Balthasar Hübmaier, one of the greatest of the Anabaptist leaders, who was burned at the stake in 1528. Yet martyrs for the truth have often to wait a long while for their vindication. And only within comparatively recent times has the world at large, and the Christian Church in particular, recognised something of their debt to the sixteenth-century religious sects who, far from being merely 'the débris of Protestantism' (to quote Dr William Manson's acid phrase), represented in fact an uprising of the human spirit of profound importance to mankind. This at any rate, was the verdict of Dr Rufus Jones, whose *Studies in Mystical Religion*, published in 1909, powerfully assisted their rehabilitation.

The appearance of the present volume in the admirably produced 'Library of Christian Classics' is, therefore, something of a portent, and the Editors are to be congratulated on their decision to include within the series this anthology of 'Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers'. The general aim of the Library is stated as being to present 'a selection of the most indispensable Christian treatises written prior to the end of the sixteenth century'. The operative word is 'selection', for the better known Anabaptist and Spiritualist writers are but slightly represented here, in order that room may be given to some characteristic specimens from other less distinguished authors, whose work has been hitherto largely neglected. This policy will not satisfy anyone who demands as much source-material as possible in one collection. But it represents a working compromise that must be regarded as inevitable. Most of the names one would expect to find (with the exception, perhaps, of David Joris) are represented here, such as Thomas Müntzer, Conrad Grebel, John Denck, Balthasar Hübmaier, Sebastian Franck and the Philips brothers. The selection is supported by twelve pages of bibliography and appropriate indexes, and it forms a contribution to research that is to be warmly commended. An excellent feature of the book is a series of brief, scholarly introductions to the individual documents, as well as lengthier introductions to the two main sections. These help the reader to gain an intelligent grasp of material which might otherwise have left an impression of scrappiness. As it is, the work presents a striking picture of various aspects of the so-called 'Radical Reformation', and does much to set it in perspective.

The addition of some extracts from the writings of Juan de Valdés is particularly to be welcomed as showing that the sixteenth-century impulse towards a new and worthier presentation of Christianity

was not confined to Protestant circles, but was active also within the Roman communion, albeit under severe limitations. The Editor of this section, Professor A. M. Mergal, of Puerto Rico, maintains that 'at the close of the sixteenth century, the contribution of Juan de Valdes to thought and reform attitudes was known all over the Continent'. The extracts from his work included here suggest that he deserves to be better known today.

The Editor of the Protestant section of the book, Professor G. H. Williams, of Harvard, rejects the idea that the general movement which it represents can be rightly classed as 'left-wing'. He thinks its radical character lay rather in the sharp distinction which it drew between the Christian Church and the State, and in its determination to recover the pattern of churchmanship exhibited in the New Testament ('The Radical Reformation broke on principle with the Catholic-Protestant *corpus christianum* and stressed the *corpus Christi* of committed believers'). And if hitherto the Church has tended to identify the power of the Spiritualist and Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century too exclusively with its more violent manifestations, this book will help to develop a juster appreciation of its true character. Meanwhile, the research which is actively proceeding today into this creative epoch of religious history cannot but be guided and reinforced by this most timely compilation.

R. L. CHILD

J. A. Comenius. A Perfect Reformation. An Anthology selected by AMADEA MOLNAR, with an Introduction by PROFESSOR J. L. HROMADKA. Published by the Comenius Faculty of Theology, Prague, 1957. Pp. 69.

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS was the last bishop of the 'Unitas Fratrum', sometimes called the Moravian Church. This short-lived but remarkably creative Church was founded five hundred years ago, and the jubilee is being celebrated in Czechoslovakia by all the Churches which have shared in its heritage. These excerpts in English from the works of the great Reformer may serve as a small reminder of the occasion. Little has been published in English about the history of the Unity of Czech Brethren, and that little is not always accurate. The recent *History of the Moravian Church* by Edward Langton has been criticised by Mr Molnar in Czech reviews for its reliance on out-of-date sources.

Comenius himself is best known as a pioneer in education, but his educational schemes were subservient to a purpose which he pursued with unflagging zeal throughout his life of exile. His aim was the reconciliation of the Churches of the Reformation, which at that time were losing their spiritual unity and falling into con-

fessional strife and arid speculation. These excerpts illustrate both his irenic spirit and his daring ecumenical vision. At a time when Protestants were devouring each other, he was working for a more thorough and universal Reformation, which would enthrone Christ as King and establish a new world order. In 1623 he wrote in his great allegory *The Labyrinth of the World* (which links him with John Bunyan and George Macdonald): 'There I saw how two or three of these chapels, which stood nearest each other, attempted to unite. But they could find no means of accomplishing this object. Each one held obstinately to its own opinions, and tried to force the rest to conform to itself.'

Two of the most interesting quotations are from the plan for a World Council, in which Comenius details the functions of a 'General Presbyterium', the 'Synod of the World', uniting all members of the Church under one head, Christ; and the moving 'Bequest' of the dying Unitas Fratrum to her sister Churches. The translation of the latter is taken from the version by Professor Matthew Spinka, of Chicago, and is much more readable than some of the other extracts, which are obscured by un-English constructions and words like 'preponderously', 'autonomic disciplinal order', 'superordinal', 'rejoys'—which should be removed any new edition.

R. Smith

History of the Hungarian Reformed Church. By Imre Revesz, Th.D. Translated by George A. F. Knight. Published by the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, Washington, D.C. Pp. 163.

This book makes available in English the work of a distinguished church-historian, at one time professor at the University of Debrecen. No complete history of the Hungarian Reformed Church has been published since 1854, when the *History of the Protestant Church in Hungary* by George Bauhoffer was translated. There are a few later writings which give a short account of the Reformed Church or of some aspects of its life, and mention may be made of a book published in 1927, of which Dr Revesz was one of the authors: *Hungarian Protestantism, Its Past, Present and Future.* This book was intended for foreign readers, and after a brief historical sketch dealt mainly with the contemporary religious situation. The original of the present volume appeared in 1949. The translation by Professor Knight, of New Zealand, formerly Church of Scotland missionary in Budapest, is considerably abridged, but covers adequately the Reformation period and the main developments during the time of repression and since the Edict of Toleration. Professor Knight has added a final chapter which brings the story up to date. The

Hungarian Church is the largest Reformed Church on the Continent and special interest attaches to some characteristic features of its history, such as the constitutional relationship with the state and the modern religious revival. It is not easy in the present political situation to arrange for the publication of such a work, and it is a tribute to the scholarship of the author and the zeal of the translator that the political barriers have been so happily transcended.

R. Smith

The Call of the Minaret. By Kenneth Cragg. Oxford University Press. 38s.

It is most regrettable that publishing costs make it necessary to issue such an excellent book at a price which will seriously restrict its sale in this country. Dr Cragg, Professor of Arabic and Islamics at Hartford Seminary and editor of *The Muslim World*, has written a book which only an expert specialist could write, and yet it is easy and even fascinating to read.

One of the crowning tragedies of history was the loss of the Middle East and North Africa to Islam, a loss which has never been made good. 'Islam has proved in history to be the supreme displacer of the faith of Christ', especially in places made famous by the Apostles, by Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine. Islam is the only great post-Christian religion, and its rise will always remain 'a painful puzzle' to the Christian mind. It has been and still is the hardest field of all for the Christian missionary. In modern times one of the most significant facts is the missionary resurgence of Islam. This is doubtless associated with political factors and is a vital part of modern nationalism and the ferment towards independence. Nevertheless, if the whole world will ever come to have one faith, it will be the Christian faith; and it is in such a confidence that Dr Cragg's book is to be understood.

Its opening chapter is a good compendium of fairly well-known facts. Great changes have come over Islam since 1955—political self-responsibility in the Middle East, Pakistan, North Africa, Indonesia; vast industrial expansion through oil; the changed lot of the fellahim; the self-conscious student world; great changes in tradition and law; the new status of women; the impact of science, though not yet on the masses; problems of population; Communism knocking at every frontier; and the breakdown of fatalism which is not Islam at its best. 'The twentieth century as it is distilled into the last decade is rife with new attitudes.'

The clue to Islam is in the few but great words of the call of the muezzin—'this complete call'—'God is most great, God is most great, I bear witness that there is no god except God; I bear witness

that Muhammad is the Apostle of God. Come ye unto prayer. Come ye unto good. Prayer is a better thing than sleep. Come ye to the best deed. God is most great. God is most great. There is no god except God.' In four chapters, comprising nearly half the book, this call is expounded in detail. In these chapters great issues are dealt with—the divine unity and the unity of Truth itself, the centrality of the Prophet's person and mission, the nature of submission to the Supreme Will, the place of prayer, pilgrimage and fasting, and the importance of the Koran, one of the shortest of Holy Books, its incompleteness being supplemented by the rise of Hadith or Tradition. All this is done in great detail, with notable linguistic and theological acumen. A very interesting sermon on what faith in God is, is quoted extensively (pp. 136-30). What religion means in practice in human society is also expounded, showing an ultimate consensus of view as to what Islamic law is, pervading all regions of life, affecting questions like almsgiving, inheritance, usury, marriage and family (monogamy is not required, and there is widespread divorce at the husband's will), and especially the conception of the Islamic State which ideally is a sort of theocracy.

The second half of the book is the more important for the Christian Church, for it deals with the call of the minaret to the Christian. Islam and Christianity cannot remain in mutual exclusion. Their relationships are crucial today. 'How shall we take the meanings of Christ into the summons from the mosque?' There is a fresh Muslim awareness of Christ. The call is to understanding, service, retrieval, interpretation and patience—each of which is dealt with in one chapter. The longest chapter is naturally given to interpretation—of the Scriptures, the Person of Christ, the Cross, the Christian God and the Christian society. All this is well done, and those who wish to pursue the issues ought to consult Dr J. W. Sweetman's *Islam and Christian Theology*, three volumes of which have now appeared. The call of the minaret is to every Christian to understand his Christianity, and 'as long as Christ is Christ, and the Church knows both itself and Him, there will be a mission to Islam'.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Man's Religions. By JOHN B. MOSS. Macmillan, New York. 41s. 6d.
Rivals of the Christian Faith. By L. H. MARSHALL. Carey Kingsgate Press. 12s. 6d.

THIS large book of 743 pages plus 12 pages of quoted references, is written by the Professor of Philosophy at Franklin and Marshall College, U.S.A. It is a revised edition of a book first published in 1949 and has extensive new sections on primitive religions, Judaism

and Islam. As was to be expected in a work of such magnitude, all the religions of the world are dealt with, grouped in four sections—Primitive and Bygone Religions, the Religions of India, the Religions of the Far East, the Religions of the Near East. Christianity is examined in the fourth group, though more fully than any of the others.

The study which is usually but absurdly called 'Comparative Religion' (it surely ought to be 'the Comparative Study of Religions') can often be very dull, especially when undertaken in an academic fashion by those who have had no direct contact at close quarters with these other faiths. This is not, however, in any sense a dull book. It is scrupulously fair—indeed almost to a fault, for it is a little non-committal on the Christian issue; its avowed aim is 'as complete objectivity as one can muster', and Professor Moss is under no illusions as to the bigness of the task.

Christianity is dealt with historically, right down to the present-day ecumenical movement. 'No religion has expressed such high ideals, or been further from achieving them.' 'In the belief that Jesus is the clearest portrayal of the character of God, all the rest of Christian doctrine is implied.' 'No single death in the world's history has so affected the human imagination.' Such sentences indicate the approach to the Christian religion, and they must be given full value over against the possible criticism that the book has too little to say on the absolute and final character of Christianity. It is of the essence of the Christian witness that one religion is not as good as another, that the examination of every one of the Christian doctrines compels to the conclusion that nothing essentially better and truer is conceivable, and that therefore conversion is necessary.

This is indeed a trustworthy and comprehensive account of the many-sided search of the human spirit for God. There are copious suggestions for further reading at the end of each chapter, and it is a book that ought to send many of its readers back to the classic scriptures of the great religions.

The second book is just one fifth of the other in size, and is very different also in method and emphasis. Dr Marshall, who was Principal of Rawdon College, died in 1953, and there is a Memoir by Mr Bonser, formerly President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, who deeply loved Dr Marshall and was much in his debt.

Beginning with Principal Baillie's *Invitation to Pilgrimage*, Dr Marshall expounds impressively 'the transcendent constraint' which is the effective starting-point of religion. Then he goes on to Greek nationalism, and points out its deep weakness. Stoicism, both Greek and Roman, is next taken up, and its failure as a religion

explained. Scientific humanism also falls short, as it so easily tends to become scientific secularism. The chapter on Russian Communism is somewhat scrappy, as it was almost bound to be; but its supreme errors are its essential link with dialectical materialism and its offer of a material earthly paradise. The last chapter on 'The Christian Answer' is the best—convinced, earnest, persuasive. The Christian system meets the supreme test at a point where all the others fail—in its utter recognition of 'the constraint of the transcendent'—ultimately God, Regnant and Redeeming.

It is a valuable book to put into the hands of young people who have serious doubts and perplexities regarding the place of the Christian faith in the wider realm of human thought.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Darkness no Darkness. By RAYMOND RAYNES, C. R. The Faith Press, London, 1958. Pp. 64. 6s.

FATHER RAYNES was a member of the Community of the Resurrection since 1932, and Superior of the Community from 1943 to 1958. This is his only devotional book, and every reader will find here much help for his spiritual life. Its professed intention is 'that it may help some people in the way of meditative prayer to a deeper devotion to and union with our Lord'. Those who read, slowly, prayerfully and one by one, the fifteen short chapters here provided, will find themselves pausing from time to time to think over what they have read, and that is indeed evidence of the success of the writer. He is not only deeply devotional, but also very practical in assisting us to face the problems, difficulties and demands of the truly Christian life and in leading us further on the mystic way.

JOHN A. LAMB

One in Christ. By K. E. SKYDSGAARD. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1957. Pp. 220. $4.00.

LET it be said right away that this is an outstanding little book on the relations between Protestants and Roman Catholics, with clear illuminating discussion on where they agree and where they differ. It is unlike any other book of its kind known to this reviewer, in the breadth of its sympathy, in the depth of its spiritual penetration, in the fairness of its treatment of the problems, in the spirit of reconciliation with which the author strives for an understanding between the opposite parties. It is an attempt at prolonged discussion 'in Christ' with those with whom the author disagrees, so that when the basic differences are laid bare, and the Evangelical 'No' has to be uttered to Roman error, it is given with greatly enhanced power and firmness. This is a book which every minister

of the Gospel ought to possess and read again and again. It is certainly one which he will want to study and ponder deeply if he is seriously concerned with the work and mission of the Church in our times.

Professor Skydsgaard begins his 'conversation' with two general chapters, one dealing with the nature of the Church and the problem of its actual division, and one designed to lay bare the contraposition of the two parties in the conversation, Evangelical and Roman Catholic, and to open out a Christian approach to ecumenical discussion between them. 'The innermost nature of the Christian Church', he claims, 'is fellowship'—a fellowship deriving from and reposing upon the creative Will of God the nature of whose love it is to give and create community in which men share with God and with one another in the divine life. Although sin has entered into this creation, bringing unbelief, selfishness and isolation which break the fellowship between God and man and man and man, 'God in Christ has come to re-establish the broken fellowship, by raising up fallen humanity to communion with Himself and thereby also uniting men with one another'. The Christian Church is at once the concrete expression of this fellowship of reconciliation and the instrument which Christ uses to proclaim His Gospel of reconciliation in the midst of a world divided and rent by sin. The Church is therefore sent by its Lord into the divided world to be and to proclaim the fellowship of reconciliation—but alas disunity has broken out in the Church itself, for the sin and the divisions of the world have invaded the Church's own life, with the result that the Church now 'exists in a situation which is not in agreement with its purpose'. So long as the Church is divided it lives in direct contradiction to the will of Christ and to its own essential nature and function. That is why the whole Gospel of reconciliation is at stake in the problem of the divided Church.

'Christ is the living Lord also over the division of the Church', and so Professor Skydsgaard insists on facing the question, 'What shall we do about a division which is impossible according to the will of Christ, and yet a present reality?' What he goes on to offer in this book is an attempt to answer this question by examining the sharpest division of all between the Evangelical Church and the Roman Church. This is not a polemic but 'an experiment and a quest' in mutual understanding in Christ where we learn that the way to life goes through death, and that it is only the way of the Cross that leads us out of division back into Oneness in Christ.

In the second chapter Professor Skydsgaard brings the two opposing parties together in order that they may take stock of one another and of themselves, each in the light of the other. This is a

frank chapter in which the weaknesses of the Protestant Churches are acknowledged, no less than their strength over against the Roman Church, and in which the ultimate and determining question is posed: 'whether or not the entire development of Roman dogma and its ecclesiatical structure truly gives to the Gospel itself the central place from which all else receives its definite and significant place'. But this is a question which the Evangelical Church must allow to be put to itself and which it must answer frankly and incisively. It is in this way that an ecumenical theology arises, but because it must be frank, 'an ecumenical theology must not become a theology without sharp teeth and without face. . . . Without losing itself and becoming completely harmless ecumenical conversation cannot become a theology without passion, without "anger".' But ecumenical theology must be conducted, nevertheless both in truth and in love. 'It must be bound to the truth, and therefore the goal is not to create a compromise or some cheap dogmatic unity by giving up that which offends the other party most.' In all ecumenical conversation the Truth itself is present as a *third party* which neither side can condemn or betray. But 'ecumenical conversation takes place in love, that is, in mutual respect and sincere openness, in which one thinks well about one's neighbour and construes all according to its best meaning, but does not on the other hand allow one's neighbour to live in peace because that is most comfortable. Love does not seek its own. It does not rigidly take a stand on its own merit, but "rises above itself" in order to meet the other. It does not meet the other with preconceived distrust, but in confidence. It does not allow any possibility for mutual understanding to be lost, and preserves hope until the last.'

On this basis and in this spirit Professor Skydsgaard then goes on to engage in conversation with Rome over five major issues: Scripture and Tradition, the Church, Faith and Grace, The Means of Grace and the Worship of the Church, and the Saints and the Virgin Mary. We cannot enter into that discussion as we have tried to enter into his opening chapters, a fuller account of which has been given in order to indicate the essentially Christian nature of the whole approach which Skydsgaard presents in these pages. And he is certainly faithful at each point to the principles he laid down at the start. On every question he seeks hard and lovingly for the agreements, testing them by the fundamental nature of the Gospel in Christ, and then probes into differences in order to lay bare the point where the ultimate division seems to lie, and indeed where there is actually a widening gap between the developing Roman dogmas and the determination of the Evangelical Churches to remain faithful to the apostolic faith and Gospel. Every chapter

is illuminating, forceful and exciting. No one need have any hesitation or fear in reading this book, be he Roman or Evangelical, for Skydsgaard's disciplined aim is to point all directly to Christ and to confront all with the unity we are already given in Him, and thereby to show the terrible nature of what divides the Church as that which threatens division from Christ Himself.

This is a work for which we cannot but thank God.

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

Living Languages in Catholic Worship. An Historical Inquiry. By CYRIL KOROLEVSKY, translated by DONALD ATTWATER. Longmans Green, London, 1957. Pp. 195. 15s.

THIS work, originally published in Paris in 1955 under the title *Liturgie en langue vivante*, will be welcomed by many, not only in the Roman Catholic Church, who are interested in the problem of vernacular in the liturgy. The question has been discussed in several recent volumes in French and in the recent Symposium, *English in the Liturgy*. The present work is particularly valuable and useful, containing as it does a vast amount of information which it would be difficult to gather elsewhere. There is a very detailed discussion on the use of Eastern national and liturgical languages, e.g. Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Ge'ez, Staroslav and Arabic. The historical reasons for the use of such languages, and also of others such as Rumanian and Hungarian (a detailed and interesting chapter being devoted to the last), are clearly expounded. The second part of the book has to do with living languages in the Western Church. Slavonic comes first, and the interesting work of SS. Cyril and Methodius is well described, and the later Slavonic translations receive careful treatment. The same holds good of other languages in the West, and the attitude of Rome is fully explained, especially for example in regard to the use of Chinese and Polish, and to the introduction of bi-lingual Rituals in Europe, India and elsewhere.

The purpose of the book is 'to provide some exact documentation, complete so far as possible, for those seeking to obtain the introduction of a measure of living languages into the public worship of the Western Church'. For those this book is indispensable. For others also it is full of interest both historically and liturgically.

JOHN A. LAMB

English in the Liturgy. A Symposium. Edited by CHARLES R. A. CUNLIFFE. Burns Oates, 1956. Paper covers, 8s 6d.

THERE has been for long in the Roman Catholic Church considerable argument about the use of vernacular in the liturgy. The recent

demand for vernacular has been strongest perhaps in Germany, France and the United States, and the demand has been allowed to a certain extent, particularly in the occasional offices contained in the *Ritual*. But the opposition has been quite strong in certain quarters. The opponents still quote in their support the views of Dom Guéranger expressed so forcibly in his *Institutions Liturgiques*. In this country the demand has not been so strong or so widely canvassed, though the Society of St. Gregory, and its organ *Liturgy*, are working for at least some use of English in the services of the Church. The whole problem has been widely discussed in the correspondence columns of the Roman Catholic press. It is thus both interesting and opportune that this symposium has been published at the present time.

In addition to the Editor's foreword there are seven essays. The first, by the Editor, is an historical survey of the occasions when vernacular has been permitted by the Holy See. The second, by Professor J. McDonald, D.D., deals with the theological principles involved, discussing in turn the evidence from Scripture, tradition, the Tridentine decrees, and the purely theological reasoning. Two arguments referred to are, first, that Hebrew, Greek and Latin are divinely-appointed sacred languages, and second, that a certain sense of mystery calls for a language other than vernacular. The first is countered by the words of Pope John VIII, giving permission for the use of Slavonic in the liturgy—'He who made the three principal languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, made also all the others for his praise and glory.' The second is more difficult to assess, and the writer concludes that there is 'something of convenience' on both sides. He is therefore inconclusive, but ends by saying that the important thing is the principle of obedience to authority, and that if experiment and change are authorised, all may be well.

The third paper, by Clifford Howell, S.J., is an argument in favour of the use of vernacular. It is very clearly written and its arguments seem altogether acceptable. It is indeed so cogent that the Rev. J. J. Coyne who follows with a paper upholding the traditional position and opposing any use of vernacular, at least in the Mass, has a very difficult task and by no means refutes the arguments of the former paper.

The next paper, by H. P. R. Finberg, deals with the problem of style, i.e. the English style which is required in a vernacular liturgy. Much of what he says is valuable for those who require guidance on the language of public prayer.

Anthony Milner writes an interesting article on music in a vernacular liturgy, dealing with the difficult question of the relationship between plainsong and the English language. He thinks the

difficulty is not insuperable. The last paper, by Dom Oswald Sumner, is entitled 'The Conversion of England'. He speaks from the pastoral and missionary angle, taking up the position that English is urgently essential both for the deepening of the spiritual life of Roman Catholics and for the bringing into his Church of English Protestants, and he says a great deal pertinent to evangelism in all denominations. But when he remarks, 'If I myself were a Protestant I would feel that the vernacular movement was a most serious and underhand attack on the safety of the Protestant position in England and place the vernacular movement as public enemy number one', he takes up an attitude which is probably unknown in most Protestant circles. The average Protestant is more likely to be in agreement with the ideals of the vernacular movement.

The whole volume is of great interest and importance. The reader is directed to various studies and articles where the problems are more fully discussed. The book provides a popular approach to a problem which will perhaps not be easy of solution, but to which a solution is becoming more and more urgent.

JOHN A. LAMB

The Benedictine Office. An Old-English Text. Edited by JAMES M. URE. Edinburgh University Press, 1957. Pp. 141. 15s.

THIS is primarily a linguistic study, and as such is of the greatest importance to students of Old English. The whole Old English text of the Office is given, together with a useful commentary, a full bibliography and a glossary of rare and interesting words. Appendixes deal with certain aspects of the text—glosses, punctuation and so on. The general reader, however, and especially he who has liturgical leanings, will find the detailed introduction most interesting. The particular text is seen against the general historical and literary monastic background, which is skilfully if briefly portrayed.

The text itself has many points of interest. There are introductions to the several Hours, only six of which are included, with the usual reasons for their observance. There are metrical paraphrases of Latin psalm-verses, of the Gloria Patri, Paternoster and Credo, which seem to have been intended for teaching purposes, after the manner of Cædmon's work. Indeed this is not strictly an office-book at all, but rather an exposition of the Latin text of certain rites of which only parts are given. The Latin psalm-verses are important as indicating the version used, which is Roman rather than Gallican, though showing some continental influences, while the OE verses give evidence of the existence of a complete English metrical psalter. The author comes to the conclusion that this Office was an adaptation of monastic Use for secular clergy, and

that the original translation was probably the work of Ælfric and that Wulfstan revised Ælfric's work and added much material of his own. He is to be congratulated on a very scholarly and valuable piece of research.

JOHN A. LAMB

A Directory of the Religious Life for the Use of those concerned with the Administration of the Religious Life in the Church of England. S.P.C.K., London, 1957. Pp. 54. 8s. 6d.

THIS is the second edition of the Directory issued by the Advisory Council of Religious Communities. Since the publication of the first edition in 1943, experience has shown the need for revision, while the fact that Religious Communities are now a more widely recognised and integral part of the life of the Church of England, has shown the urgency of fuller recognition. This Directory will be useful and essential for any who are interested in the Religious Life, in the mode of admission to that state, and the government of these communities.

JOHN A. LAMB

Printed in Great Britain by ROBERT CUNNINGHAM AND SONS LTD., Alva